REVOLUTION
FROM 1789 TO 1906

Documents selected and edited with Notes and Introductions, &c.

By R. W. POSTGATE

Of this illuminating history of European Revolutions, and of the rise of the working class, the London "Spectator" says: "All students of politics and social economics are under a debt of gratitude to Mr. Postgate for this book. The volume supplies us with the chief documents of the Socialistic and Communistic sides of the revolutions that have taken place in Europe during the past 117 years. These include the great French Revolution, the Chartist Movement, the Revolutions of 1848, the first Internationale, the Commune, and the Russian Revolutions. Mr. Postgate not only helps us by giving us under one cover documents which otherwise must be searched for in many volumes, and sometimes in quite inaccessible places, but edits them in a very scholarly fashion."

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

THE PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

A Personal Narrative

By Robert Lansing

As Secretary of State throughout the War, and as one of the five American representatives at the Peace Conference, Mr. Lansing had a unique opportunity for knowing what actually happened at Paris. His account of the part played by America in the Peace Negotiations, and particularly his full and frank inside story of the inception and carrying through of the plan for a League of Nations, cannot fail to remain one of the outstanding documents in diplomatic history.

But beyond this, his book has rare interest as a vivid narrative of the author's personal relations with President Wilson up to their final dramatic break. In the entire field of American history, there has probably been no more interesting situation than this, or one more deeply involved with the future course of world history, and Mr. Lansing's frank account makes a story of absorbing human interest.

Illustrated

REFERENCE LIBRARY * HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO * BOSTON, MASS.
Archive
Collection
This book is due on the last date stamped below and if borrowed by mail is to be returned within 7 days

Revolution
1789-1906

REFERENCE LIBRARY * HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. * BOSTON, MASS.
Archive
Collection

This book may not leave the Offices
and if borrowed must be returned within 7 days

Revolution

from 1789 *to* 1906

Documents selected and edited with
Notes and Introductions by

R. W. POSTGATE

BOSTON & NEW YORK

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

1921

PRINTED IN ENGLAND AT THE PELICAN PRESS
No. 2 Carmelite Street, E.C. London

D.

D. D. D.

R. W. P.

Preface

THE collection of documents which follows is not an attempt to depict the course of various, arbitrarily selected revolutions in the words of the revolutionaries themselves. It would have been easy, no doubt, and more exciting to select the most vivid contemporaneous account of, say, the taking of the Bastille, or of the burning of the Hôtel de Ville in 1871, and from these and other recitals to have constructed a fairly accurate, and certainly interesting, history of the dramatic moments of the European Revolution. The aim of the Editor has been rather to select speeches, posters, and articles which show what the revolution "was all about": what were the problems confronting the revolutionaries: what were their principles, the thoughts in their minds, and the phrases they used: and particularly which of their acts became the seeds of the future revolution. For this reason the comparatively dull speech of Danton's on Property has been preferred to his famous "audacity" speech. The latter is a splendid, but passing, piece of declamation, the former typical of the Jacobin policy or lack of policy in regard to the social problems they had themselves raised. Similarly, much space is given to the conspiracy of Babeuf; not that it played a very great part at the time, but because its importance in after years was immense

The facts given in the Introductions may seem to be distorted or described from a perverse point of view. In actual distortion, omission, or falsehood, it is hoped that the sins of this book are few. Yet the attitude taken up may seem prejudiced, unhistorical even. If this be so, the Editor can only protest that it is not possible to write a good history of a revolution without understanding it, and, therefore, in some degree sympathising with it—unless, of course, a revolution is regarded as a pathological or criminal phenomenon—which is not merely unhistorical but monstrously arrogant. It must also be remembered that the "common impression" (which this book may be found to contradict) is frequently erroneous especially in what concerns revolutionary periods. For example, it is a very common impression that the Paris Commune of 1871 was bloodthirsty. In point of fact, it shot, under circumstances of extreme provocation a small number of hostages whose lives were "according to the rules of war" already forfeit. Their opponents, the Versaillese, were guilty of a massacre whose savage comprehensiveness passes our understanding. At least twenty thousand men and women, probably as many as thirty-five thousand, lost their lives in this holocaust, which preceded the orthodox shootings and deportations after trial. When we read M. Camille Pelletan's detailed study of these horrors we seem to be reading of a vast pogrom or of some bestial exploit of Jenghiz Khan. If a narrative written with knowledge, and under the impression of this massacre differs from one written in real or feigned ignorance of it, there is little room for surprise.

It is also hoped that there is some connection between the various sections and that they are not a series of disconnected incidents. It is obvious that the modern revolutionary movement must be treated as a whole, and that its history cannot be written from a purely national standpoint. Something alien to French national history intrudes itself, for example, into the history of the Commune. This non-

national element is precisely the revolutionary force, the International. *This revolutionary force assumes different aspects to suit the particular problems of different countries, but it is in essence the same. The Commune is a chapter in French history, no doubt, but it is also, and equally clearly, a chapter, if not the only chapter, in the history of the* First International. *Similarly a historian who would write the history of the German Revolution of* 1848 *with an eye only to the national history, would deal adequately with its connections with* Jahn, Arndt, *and other relics of the war of* 1813, *but would omit figures equally important—* Maximilien Robespierre *and* Alphonse de Lamartine.

The European Revolution as a whole changes from bourgeois to proletarian in the year 1848. *The new, free form of society necessary for the full development of modern industrial capitalism had been completely outlined, but incompletely achieved by the great French Revolution of* 1789. *The small employing class and the middle class, in the interval between* 1794 *and* 1848, *provide the revolutionary material, and their aims are naturally limited to the restoration of the Republic as proclaimed in the* Declaration of the Rights of Man. *We even have, in Lyons in* 1830 (*p.* 78), *the ludicrous sight of the rebellious workers affirming their respectability and dissociating themselves from the disreputable revolutionary bourgeoisie. But* 1848 *ends the bourgeois revolution, for during the actual revolution uprises a proletarian and socialist revolutionary movement. This can be most clearly seen in France and Germany. In England it had been clear since the assumption of power by the middle class in* 1832.

*Finally, the selection of this date—*1832*—the year of the assumption of power by the middle class—for the beginning of the English documents is largely arbitrary. One has to begin somewhere, and this date has seemed as convenient as any.*

R. W. POSTGATE

Note

THIS work is arranged upon the following plan. Each chapter and each section of a chapter deals with a separate revolution. Each section is divided into two halves, the *Introduction* and the *Documents*. The Documents are reproduced as nearly as possible as they appeared at the time. Italics, for example, are never due to the Editor: and in translation it has been thought better to be occasionally clumsy, but accurate, than to paraphrase for the sake of better English. Where a portion of a Document has been summarised, this is in italics and indicated by the use of square brackets [*so*]. The frequent use of runners (. . . .) in French has made it necessary to use only asterisks (* * *) to mark omissions. The chief events have been indicated in brief under their dates, and the Documents are inserted in their proper chronological order between these date-lines. It is hoped that thereby the Documents will fall into their right chronological place at the first glance.

The Introductions, in those cases where there are already adequate connected histories in English, as, for example, of the German Revolution of 1848, are limited to the minimum necessary to explain the connection between the Documents. In other cases, where there is either no English history available —in Chapter IV, Section II, for example—or the selection of Documents or the attitude of the Editor seemed to require remark, the Introductions have become somewhat more lengthy.

I wish particularly to thank Mr. M. B. Reckitt for his assistance and advice concerning Chapter I. A large portion of the Introduction to Section II was written by him, and nearly every page of the chapter bears the mark of his criticism. Mr. Laurence Welsh helped me very materially in the translation of the German Documents of 1848, where my own meagre German would have proved an almost insurmountable barrier, and by many suggestions made in other parts of the book. Mr. George Belt has earned my gratitude by the loan of several rare Chartist books. I also wish to thank the Socialist Labour Press for permission to reprint their copyright translation of the Communist Manifesto.

R. W. P.

ADDENDA

Since the Bibliographical note to the section on Chartism was written, there has appeared a good general history—Julius West's *History of the Chartist Movement* (Constable, 16s.)

By a slip of the pen on page 23 I have made Robespierre defend the cult of *Reason*. The word should be *Deism*. Robespierre believed in the Supreme Being, and persecuted the Reason worshippers.

The reference on p. 109, line 3, should be to page 126, not page 0.

Table of Contents

Preface, p. vii
Note, p. ix
Table, p. xi

CHAPTER I. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1789

SECTION I. PROLOGUE

Introduction, p. 3

1 The American Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776, p. 4

SECTION II. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789—1796

Introduction, p. 6

2 Oath of the National Assembly, June 20, 1789, p. 26
3 J. P. Marat: *Ami du Peuple*, No. xi, September 21, on the Decree of August 4, 1789, p. 26
4 Resolution of the Cordeliers, October 4, 1789, p. 28
5 Declaration of the Rights of Man, signed October 5, 1789, p. 30
6 Decree Confiscating Church Lands, November 2, 1789, p. 32
7 J. P. Marat: *C'en est fait de nous*, July 26, 1790, p. 32
8 Comte de Mirabeau: Speech on Émigrés, February 28, 1791, p. 35
9 Law on Associations: June 14, 1791, p. 37
10 Declaration of the Cordeliers Club, June 22, 1791, p. 38
11 Manifesto Signed in the Champs de Mars, July 16, 1791, p. 38
12 Declaration of Pillnitz, August 27, 1791, p. 39
13 Address of the Forty-Seven Sections, August 3, 1792, p. 40
14 (Girondin) Law on Communal Lands, August 14, 1792, p. 40
15 G. J. Danton: Speech (on Property), September 21, 1792, p. 41
16 Address of the Jacobins Club, dated April 13, 1793, p. 41
17 M. M. I. Robespierre: Speech (on Property), April 24, 1793, p. 43
18 M. E. Guadet: Speech Moving the Suppression of the Commune, May 18, 1793, p. 46
19 (Jacobin) Law on Communal Lands, June 10, 1793, p. 47
20 J. R. Hebert: *Père Duchesne* on Marat's death, July 15, 1793, p. 48
21 Decree on Feudal Rights, July 17, 1793, p. 50
22 J. R. Hebert: *Père Duchesne* on Business Men, September 1, 1793, p. 51
23 B. C. Desmoulins: Last Number of the *Vieux Cordelier*, March, 1794, p. 52
24 S. Maréchal: Manifesto of the Equals, May, 1796, p. 54
25 F. N. Babeuf: "Analysis of his Doctrine," May, 1796, p. 56
26 "Soldier, Stop and Read," May, 1796, p. 57
27 F. N. Babeuf: Draft of Decree, May, 1796, p. 58

CHAPTER II. INTERMEDIATE

SECTION I. IRELAND, 1786

Introduction, p. 63

28 Letter addressed to the Munster Peasantry, July 1, 1786, p. 64
29 Declaration of the Belfast Volunteers, July 14, 1791, p. 65

30 Oath of the United Irishmen (first form), 1792, p. 66
31 Oath of the United Irishmen (later form), 1795, p. 66
32 Proclamation by John Sheares, intended for May 24, 1798, p. 67
33 Proclamation by Robert Emmet, July 23, 1803, p. 68

SECTION II. THE MUTINY AT THE NORE, 1797
Introduction, p. 71
34 Nore Seamen's Oath, p. 72
35 Nore Seamen's Song, No. 13, p. 72
36 Manifesto of the Delegates to their Countrymen, June 6, 1797, p. 73
37 Resolution of the *Sandwich* Committee, June 7, 1797, p. 74

SECTION III. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1830
Introduction, p. 76
38 Summary of the Republican Programme, July, 1830, p. 78
39 Declaration of the Lyons Chiefs of Sections, November 23, 1831, p. 78

CHAPTER III. THE REVOLUTIONARY BRITISH WORKING CLASS, 1832—1854

SECTION I. THE TRADES UNIONS, 1832—1834
Introduction, p. 82
40 R. Owen: Address to the Operative Builders, August 26, 1833, p. 90
41 R. Owen: Lecture, September 8, 1833, p. 91
42 Proposals for a Builders' Guild, September 21, 1833, p. 91
43 Derby Committee Report, December 30, 1833, p. 93
44 J. E. Smith: Second Letter on Associated Labour, March 22, 1834, p. 93
45 The Legacy of Robert Owen to the World, March 29, 1834, p. 95
46 J. E. Smith: "On the Prospects of Society," March 30, 1834, p. 98
47 The *Herald of the Rights of Industry* on an 8-hours day, April 5, 1834, p. 98
48 Grand National Consolidated Trades Union Programme and Manifesto, April 15, 1834, p. 99
49 R. Owen: Lecture (on the *Pioneer*), April 27, 1834, p. 100
50 The *Crisis:* Leader Deprecating Strikes, May 3, 1834, p. 101
51 The "Document" (London Tailors), May 23, 1834, p. 101

SECTION II. CHARTISM, 1837—1854
Introduction, p. 104
52 *Bronterre's National Reformer*, No. 1, Statement of Aims, January 7, 1837, p. 113
53 London Working-men's Association, Petition of February 18, 1837, p. 113
54 P. Bussey: Speech on Arming, October 15, 1838, p. 117
55 Feargus O'Connor: Speech on Physical Force, November 6, 1838, p. 119
56 Rev. J. R. Stephens: *The Political Preacher*, January 6, 1839, p. 119
57 J. C. Coombe: "What is the Object of the Charter?" April 27, 1839, p. 123

58 The Eight Questions of the Convention, May 13, 1839, p. 124
59 Insurrectionary Leaflet of May 23, 1839, p. 125
60 Convention's Resolutions on the Birmingham Riot, July 4, 1839, p. 126
61 The First National Petition, July 12, 1839, p. 127
62 Extracts from the Second National Petition, May 2, 1842, p. 130
63A & B Resolution and Placard Calling the General Strike, August 12, 1842, p. 132
64 Feargus O'Connor on Communism, 1847, p. 133
65 Resolutions of the Convention, April 5, 1848, p. 135
66 Ernest Jones: *Song of the Lower Classes*, 1854, p. 135

CHAPTER IV. THE REVOLUTIONS OF 1848

PROLOGUE: THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

Introduction, p. 139
67 The Communist Manifesto, 1847, p. 140

SECTION I. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1848—1851

Introduction, p. 165
68 Louis Blanc: *Organisation of Labour*, Conclusion, 1839, p. 186
69 Ledru-Rollin: Election Address, July, 1841, p. 187
70-72 Proclamations of Provisional Governments, February 24, 1848, p. 189
73-76 Decrees of February 25, 1848, p. 191
77 L. A. Blanqui: Speech on February 26, 1848, p. 191
78 Decree Instituting National Workshops, February 28, 1848, p. 192
79 Gloveworkers' Election Placard to the Luxembourg, March, 1848, p. 193
80 A. de Lamartine: *Manifesto to Europe*, March 2, 1848, p. 193
81 Decree Abolishing Sub-Contracting, March 2, 1848, p. 197
82 E. Thomas: Proposals on National Workshops to the Government on March 5, 1848, p. 198
83 Committee of the Luxembourg Assembly, March 10, 1848, p. 199
84 Louis Blanc: Programme Outlined on March 20, 1848, p. 199
85 E. Thomas: Conversations with M. Marie, March 20-28, 1848, p. 201
86-87 Conciliation Awards of the Luxembourg (*Plumbers and Paviors*), 1848, p. 202
88 Election Placard of the Luxembourg, April, 1848, p. 204
89 E. Thomas: Workshop Regulations, April, 1848, p. 205
90 A. Barbès: Placard Concerning the Rouen Massacres, April 29, 1848, p. 206
91 Documents Prepared for Issue on May 15, 1848: (A), Provisional Government; (B), Seven Decrees, p. 207
92 Decrees Actually Issued on May 15, 1848, p. 209
93 Decree on the Workshops Prepared for May 24, Issued June 21, 1848, p. 210
94 Louis Pujol: *Prophecy of Days of Blood*, June, 1848, p. 211

95 Luxembourg and Workshops: Joint Placard, June 18, 1848, p. 213
96 Insurgents' Proclamations, June 26, 1848, p. 214
97-100 Proclamations and Facts of the June Revolt, 1848, p. 215
101 Ledru-Rollin: On Family and Property, August 25, 1848, p. 216
102 L. A. Blanqui: Extracts from the *Critique Sociale*, 1869, p. 218

SECTION II. THE HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION, 1848—1849
Introduction, p. 222
103 Summary of the Bill on the Magyar Tongue, February 29, 1848, p. 225
104 Six Points Moved by Kossuth, March 18, 1848, p. 225
105 The Hungarian Declaration of Independence, April 19, 1849, p. 226
106 Abdication of the Provisional Government, August 11, 1849, p. 228

SECTION III. THE ITALIAN REVOLUTION, 1848—1849
Introduction, p. 231
107 "Manifesto to the European Peoples" after the Expulsion of the Austrians from Milan, March 23, 1848, p. 234
108 Letter of Manin on Socialism, January 14, 1849, p. 235
109 Decree of the Roman Republic on Necessitous Citizens, April 4, 1849, p. 236
110 Roman Republic Decree on Peasant Proprietorship and on Division of Church Lands, April, 1849, p. 236
111 Last Proclamation of the Venetian Ministry of Marine, August 9, 1849, p. 237

SECTION IV. THE GERMAN REVOLUTION OF 1848—1849
Introduction, p. 240
112 Programme of the Offenburg Conference, Winter, 1847, p. 249
113 Anonymous Republican Poster, March, 1848, p. 249
114 Hanau People's Commission, Instructions to the Elector, March 9, 1848, p. 250
115 Austrian Emperor's Proclamation, March 14, 1848, p. 252
116 "The Democrats to the Soldiers": Pamphlet of March, 1848, p. 252
117 King of Prussia: Proclamation "To My Beloved Berliners," March 18, 1848, p. 253
118 L. Feuerbach: Letter on Economic Conditions, April 3, 1848, p. 254
119 Minutes of the First Meeting of the Berlin *Arbeiter Club*, April 6, 1848, p. 255
120 Fr. Hecker on the First Baden Revolt, April, 1848, p. 257
121 G. Struve: *The Republican Official Gazette*, No. 1, September 22, 1848, p. 258
122 Austrian Diet: Proceedings on October 7 and 8, 1848, p. 260
123 Resolutions of the Revolutionary Assembly, May 13, 1849, p. 262

SECTION V. THE IRISH REVOLUTIONARIES OF 1848
Introduction, p. 265
124 Resolutions Moved by W. Smith O'Brien, February 3, 1848, p. 266

125 From John Mitchel's *Letters to Ulstermen*, April and May, 1848, p. 267
126 *The Irish Felon* on the Suppression of the June Revolt in Paris, July 1, 1848, p. 269
127 From J. Fintan Lalor's *The Faith of a Felon*, July 8, 1848, p. 270

EPILOGUE

Introduction, p. 272
128 The Republican Manifesto of Kossuth, Mazzini, and Ledru-Rollin Issued on the Fall of Sebastopol, September, 1855, p. 273

CHAPTER V. THE COMMUNE OF PARIS

Introduction, p. 277
129 *La Patrie en Danger*, No. 50, by L. A. Blanqui, October 30, 1870, p. 288
130 Manifesto of the Central Committee, March 20, 1871, p. 289
131 First Proclamations of the Commune, March 29, 1871, p. 291
132 J. B. Millière: "The Revolution of 1871" in *La Commune*, April 3, 1871, p. 292
133 The Commune: "To the Departments," April 6, 1871, p. 295
134 Decree on the Vendôme Column, April 12, 1871, p. 296
135 Decree on Co-operative Workshops, April 16, 1871, p. 297
136 Jules Nostag: "Country-Humanity" in *La Révolution*, April 16, 1871, p. 297
137 Programme of the Commune, April 19, 1871, p. 298
138 Mme. A. Léo: "Revolution Without Women" in *La Sociale*, May 8, 1871, p. 300
139 P. Grousset: Official Manifesto "To the Great Towns," May 15, 1871, p. 302
140 Declaration of the Minority, May 15, 1871, p. 303
141 Ch. Delescluze's Last Proclamation, May 22, 1871, p. 304
142 Manifesto of the General Council of the International, called "The Civil War in France," May 30, 1871, p. 305

CHAPTER VI. THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION OF 1905

Introduction, p. 341
143 Petition of the Workers to the Tsar, January 22, 1905, p. 363
144 Gapon's Letter After the Massacre, January 22, 1905, p. 365
145 Resolution of the Social Democratic Party, January 23, 1905, p. 366
146 Resolution of the St. Petersburg Advocates, January 23, 1905, p. 366
147 Resolution of the Novgorod Zemstvo, January, 1905, p. 367
148 Message of the Holy Synod, January 27, 1905, p. 367
149 Message of the Tsar, February 1, 1905, p. 368
150 L. Trotsky: *The Events in St. Petersburg*, February 2, 1905, p. 369
151A Announcement of the Execution of the Grand Duke Sergius by the Organisation of Combat, February 18, 1905, p. 370
151B Defence of the Act by the Moscow Social Revolutionaries, February 18, 1905, p. 370

152 From the Tsar's Manifestoes of March 3, 1905, p. 371
153 Black Hundred Manifestoes of April and May, 1905, p. 372
154 First Programme of the Peasants' Union, May, 1905, p. 372
155 Resolution of the June Congress of Lettish Social Democrats, 1905, p. 373
156 Manifesto of the Rebel Sailors in the Black Sea, June 27, 1905, p. 374
157 Resolution at the Foundation of the Petrovsk Branch of the Peasants' Union, July, 1905, p. 375
158 Reports to the Congress of the Peasants' Union, July 31, 1905, p. 376
159 Resolution of the All-Russia Zemstvo Congress, September 25, 1905, p. 380
160 Orthodox Pogrom Circular, October, 1905, p. 380
161 Minutes of the St. Petersburg Soviet during the Second General Strike, November 14 to 19, 1905, p. 381
162 Resolution passed simultaneously all over Lettonia, November, 1905, p. 383
163 Declaration of the Khvalinshin Peasants upon the Terror, November 18, 1905, p. 384
164 First Common Manifesto of the Russian Socialist Parties, December 13, 1905, p. 385
165 "Appeal to the Civilised World" by the Lettish Social Democratic Union May, 1906, p. 386
166 The Viborg Manifesto, July 23, 1906, p. 391

APPENDIX

167 Debates of the First International on Workers' Control, p. 392

INDEX, p. 397

Chapter I

The French Revolution of 1789

Section I

Prologue: *The American Declaration of Independence, July* 4, 1776

Introduction

THE Document appended is not given as an indication of the character of the American War of Independence. It is merely placed here as the prologue to the French Revolution, and hence the second half, being a recital of fact, is omitted and the statement of principles alone retained.

These principles are those which inspired the famous French Declaration of the Rights of Man. French troops were sent to aid the Americans in their fight for independence, and brought back a tale of a happy and prosperous country, which had broken the tyrannies of the Old World, and based its constitution upon Reason, and near to the edge of civilisation, in contact with the noble savage of the philosophers, had attained—or at least, was likely to attain—the quiet happiness of the Golden Age. The most conservative and level-headed politicians, including Lafayette himself, were deceived and filled with a new thirst for the regeneration of society. It seemed as though the American Revolution had brought down to earth and given bodily form to theories which had hitherto seemed but amiable dreams. The French forgot that the condition of caste-ridden France, old and limited in territory, could not be compared with that of a society of prosperous slave-owners, in a country untouched and allowing of indefinite expansion. Their crusade, to restore the disinherited of the earth, they took to be similar to the mundane action of a handful of landowners freeing themselves from a political and economic connection which had become burdensome to them.

Document

1 THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION OF THE THIRTEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. JULY 4

WHEN, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the Powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it and to institute new Government, laying its foundations on such principles and organising its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and, accordingly, all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world. * * *

Section II

France, 1789-1796

2	Oath of the National Assembly, June 20	1789
3	J. P. Marat: *Ami du Peuple* (No. 11) on the Decrees of August 4, September 21	1789
4	Resolution of the Cordeliers, October 4	1789
5	Declaration of the Rights of Man, signed October 5	1789
6	Decree Confiscating Church Lands, November 2	1789
7	J. P. Marat: *C'en est fait de nous*, July 26	1790
8	Comte de Mirabeau: Speech on Émigrés, February 28	1791
9	Law on Associations: June 14	1791
10	Declaration of the Cordeliers Club, June 22	1791
11	Manifesto Signed in the Champs de Mars, July 16	1791
12	Declaration of Pillnitz, August 27	1791
13	Address of the Forty-Seven Sections, August 3	1792
14	(Girondin) Law on Communal Lands, August 14	1792
15	G. J. Danton: Speech (on Property), September 21	1792
16	Address of the Jacobin Club, April 13	1793
17	M. M. I. Robespierre: Speech (on Property), April 24	1793
18	M. E. Guadet: Speech Moving the Suppression of the Commune, May 18	1793
19	(Jacobin) Law on Communal Lands, June 10	1793
20	J. R. Hebert: *Père Duchesne* on Marat's death, July 16	1793
21	Decree on Feudal Rights, July 17	1793
22	J. R. Hebert: *Père Duchesne* on Business Men, September 1	1793
23	B. C. Desmoulins: Last Number of the *Vieux Cordelier*, March	1794
24	S. Maréchal: Manifesto of the Equals, May	1796
25	F. N. Babeuf: "Analysis of his Doctrine," May	1796
26	"Soldier, Stop and Read," May	1796
27	F. N. Babeuf: Draft of a Decree, May	1796

Introduction

MOVEMENTS have strange genealogies, and revolutionary movements not least. It may seem curious indeed to date the origin of Europe's modern movement for the emancipation of man from social tyranny from the meeting of an assembly of feudal estates in the pleasure-palace of a king. Yet "1789—Meeting of the States-General at Versailles" is for most revolutionaries as decisively the birthday of their crusade as "1066—The Norman Conquest" is for the everyday Englishman the first memorable date in the history of his country. Nor is the paradox in either case unjustifiable. It was the victory of the invader from Normandy which finally established Britain as an integral part of the civilisation of medieval Europe, as a result of which this island was racially and socially born again and—in a large measure—"born different." So, again, it was the triumphant assertion of popular sovereignty, by which the States-General, at the first challenge, transformed itself into the National Assembly,[1] that laid securely the essential foundation-stone of the modern revolutionary claim that men through every appropriate instrument should take their political and economic destiny into their own hands and henceforward determine both the one and the other in their own way.

It is thus in the broadest sense true that the Great French Revolution is the parent alike of our contemporary democratic and Socialist movements. The history of those fifteen years shows us how completely the spirit and the framework of an outworn society can pass away.

The Revolution cleared the stage of its vain and faded feudal pageant, and we must not judge it too hardly if the "bourgeois" drama upon which it embarked is not much to our liking It is for to-day, and not for yesterday, that we may help to choose the play. The great actors of the revolutionary tragedy were not Communists; if Socialism finds in the Revolution a unique starting-point for its own crusade, it is rather in that ideal of equality which dominated its spiritual outlook than in its economic formulæ or even its material results in the tenure of property.

Despite the tendency of a few philosophers to dally with Communist ideals, no trace of a Socialist movement in the modern sense is to be found in the thought or practice of the eighteenth century. Communism was never at this time even one of the questions of the day. Philosophical attacks on property were not considered dangerous, as is shown by the fact that in the list of books condemned by authority no Socialistic work appears; it is the authority of religion and the privileges of feudalism that are felt to be imperilled, and not the claims of property—which was, indeed, already widely distributed in France. Nor did the philosophers—with a few notable exceptions[2]—interest themselves in Communism as an inspiring possibility;

[1] See Document 2.

[2] Of these the most notable is Morelly. His *Code de la Nature* (1756) is not only interesting in itself, but important as being a source from which Babeuf drew his inspiration.

their Utopias lay in the past, not the future, and they looked backward to a State of Nature rather than forward to a Social Democracy. The State of Nature, originally a philosophic concept, tended to become identified with an imagined Golden Age, inhabited by the "noble savage," at first postulated, but soon accepted as an actual personage of ideal attributes or at least potentialities. The tales of travellers to the New World testified—or were believed to testify—to his charm and innocence. "Distance lends enchantment to the view"—especially to those which it renders invisible, and the breadth of the Atlantic lay between the dream and the reality. Had the Communism of the eighteenth century dealt less with the "bon sauvage" imagined to exist in different continents, and more with the far from noble savage to which economic tyranny and political misgovernment was reducing the day-labourer and even the peasant-proprietor of France, it would be more interesting to us, as it would have been more stimulating to its contemporaries.

A Socialist movement can only be based on an appreciation of the primacy of economic factors in the social problem and the outlines at any rate of an economic science. Both these conditions were absent in the France of 1789. Economic science, of course, there was none. "Political Economy," then in its infancy, was a matter of theory only, and owed little or nothing to the observation of facts. The Physiocrats enunciated doctrines that were hostile rather than favourable to Socialism. What was of more practical consequence during the early years of Louis XVI's reign was the circumstance that with their watchword of "laissez-faire" the great reforming minister Turgot was in agreement, and by the application of physiocratic principles he hoped to rescue the Government from the crisis at which it had arrived. But Turgot's appreciation of economic issues, though incomplete, was almost unique at the time. It was to political change that all men were looking for the salvation of society. The experiment of a social order in which all men shared equally in civil rights and political activities was one that had not yet been tried and found wanting. To men who had never experienced the thrill of "writing a constitution," or even the doubtful satisfaction of living under an unwritten one, the prospect of founding a government on the principles of liberty and reason was sufficiently absorbing. This passion for a constitution is the most striking feature of the early days of the Revolution, and Arthur Young found it especially strange to his English conception of politics. "Making the Constitution," he said, "is a new term they have adopted, as if a constitution were a pudding to be made from a receipt." But this is exactly how it appeared to the eighteenth-century Frenchman, and the pudding was the more likely to be successful, he argued, since there could be no room for doubt about its ingredients. "Politics is a science which I believe myself to have completed," said Sieyes, and few of his colleagues would have hesitated to say the same.

A constitution was to the mind of France at that moment the latch-key to the Garden of the Hesperides. The privileged orders demanded that "the old constitution should be restored"; the Third Estate that a new

constitution should be established. From this latter expedient countless blessings were expected to flow—the extinction of feudalism, the end of centralised and despotic bureaucracy and "the career open to talents." But economic remedies few could be found to urge, and Communist speculations had not entered the head of one in a million of the population.[1] The truth of this is confirmed by a study of the "cahiers," or summary of grievances and proposed remedies which every town and district of France was invited to contribute during 1788 to assist the deliberations of the States-General. Almost everything is to be found in the "cahiers," save those two principles which we have come to associate most closely with the revolutionary spirit—Republicanism and Socialism. Modifications in the rights of property as such are rare in the "cahiers." A few stray sentences suggest that the amount of property held by the lords should be limited; that monstrous fortunes should be made to disgorge; that means should be found to make it easier for the poor to acquire property; that common lands should be shared out among the poor, whose means of life should not in any circumstances be liable to be sold up. But for the most part the "cahiers" are not only not Socialist in tenour, they do not even dabble in proposals for economic legislation, or what we know as "social reforms." This is natural enough, for what the French people felt they needed was to get rid of unnatural conditions and artificial burdens, which accomplished, all would then be well. The desire of the peasant, harassed by the Government's "Intendant" on the one hand, and the lord's bailiff on the other, was to be rid of both. While as for the "journalier" (the agricultural day-labourer) and the artisan of the towns, these had neither the imagination nor the opportunity to formulate plans of reform—nor even to hope for them.

Despite the existence of these latter classes, the "proletariat"—in the modern sense—the "raw material" of all Socialist movements, is not to be found in French society at the end of the eighteenth century. Neither the land system nor the development of an industrial plutocracy had so far robbed the mass of Frenchmen of all economic resource, and the peasant in ownership of his own land was still a majority of the nation. True, his "proprietorship" was far from being absolute: he suffered under feudal tyrannies and exactions, which were always oppressive and too often cruel and ruinous. The lord, whose function it had once been to protect him, was now for the most part an absentee, regarding his land as a means of supporting a profligate existence at Versailles, and what remained to the peasant when the lord's agents had extracted the last *sou* which feudal custom could be strained to demand was a prey to the exactions of the Government's representative. Nor were those exactions confined to taxes in money and produce; the Government could, and commonly did, impress his labour for the "corvée," by which expedient the roads were nominally kept in repair. But though the land settlement of the Revolution is of the greatest importance, the peasant himself had not a large share in it, though the corn-riots and other forms of "direct action" in

[1] Almost the only Communist pamphlets amongst the thousands issued on the eve of the Revolution were by Babeuf and Sylvain Maréchal, concerned in 1796 in the "Conspiracy of the Equals."

1789 had an important influence on events, and the resistance which the peasants would have offered to any return of feudal exactions after they had once been nominally abolished in the first months of the Revolution was a factor that even the privileged orders were not slow to recognise. But the peasant himself was "inarticulate"—little that was carried out in the name of the Revolution sprang from his initiative, and none resisted more strenuously the conscription by which its achievements were defended and preserved.

More wretched still was the "journalier" (the agricultural day-labourer), who existed, though in no large numbers, scattered about the country-side, exposed to that very "free bargaining" which was the ideal of the physiocratic philosophers, who represented the "best modern thought" of the time. Crushed, helpless, and threatened by actual starvation in the famines which were a common feature of the years before the Revolution, the proletarian of the land was drifting into the towns, and especially to Paris, to become the proletarian of the streets. The process had not gone far by 1789, and the artisan class still formed no large percentage of the population. The share of this class in the Revolution was considerable, but it was, in the main, indirect. Of "class-consciousness" in the true sense it had none. It was capable of violent action, which was often successful, and susceptible of the organisation by which such action was prepared. But it could not organise itself nor choose a leader from its own ranks whom it was willing to follow. Politicians of all shades were ready to prescribe for the workers' needs, and they themselves were ready to march at the orders of those who needed them, but of initiative they were deprived at the beginning of the Revolution by their exclusion from the franchise, and the mood of suspicion which fell upon them left them a prey to any faction which sought to fan their anger for its own purposes. High hopes and bitter sufferings are dangerous, when the hopes go unrealised, and the sufferings remain unappeased. Before many months of 1789 had gone by, the masses were already being maddened by the decay of their expectations, and by the hunger which was the skeleton ever present at the revolutionary feast of reason.

But it was the Third Estate proper which drove forward, as it so largely initiated the Revolution. This was broadly divisible into two elements, the "bourgeois" and the "professionals." The former had no connection of any sort with the noble class, from which it was as completely cut off as were the workers themselves; the latter formed a kind of hyphen between the nobles, by whom they were patronised, and the bourgeoisie, whom they despised. Academic, wealthy, and in a measure exclusive, this latter element contributed many leaders to the Revolution in its early years, and never entirely lost its hold upon events until the overthrow of the Girondin party. With the rise of their opponents of the Mountain the control falls into the hands of men who represent essentially the bourgeois class in the strict sense—the great figures of the Committee of Public Safety, and the generals of the new armies were almost all sprung from this class.

At the summit of this social pyramid was the "noblesse." This was neither a small class nor a homogeneous one; not all its members were rich; and many were, or at least prided themselves on being, liberal-minded. This section was really anxious to contribute its share to the building of the new France. But it entertained the illusion, which so constantly clouds the vision of those who are at once prosperous and "advanced," that society can be re-established on liberty and justice, and they themselves remain just where they are. Such a result would have been more than usually miraculous in the case of the French noblesse in 1789—for its privileges, which were many and included exemption from direct taxation, were based on the most rigid notions of social caste. As Mr. Belloc has put it: "This made them, wherever they went, a particular class, to be revered by fools and able to irritate their enemies merely by existing—a privilege of some value." The noblesse had been for some years before in conflict with the Government; they had "tasted blood" in the struggle, and were eager to pursue it. A Feudal Assembly in which they might hope to take a predominant place was an expedient that strongly appealed to them, and the Government had come to a crisis in which it could no longer resist a universal demand.

Inspiring this demand, and re-enforcing it, was a new vision, already very widespread, of the heights which the community might by such means attain. This new vision had arisen partly under the influence of the philosophers, but it was due even more to the reforms already initiated by the Government, which, faltering though they were, opened men's eyes to the possibility that something could be done. If misery and injustice were not, after all, in the nature of things, then, perhaps, autocracy and feudalism were not so, either. Men at last saw the light beyond the trees of the forest in which they had so long thought themselves lost, and the stampede began, which we call the Revolution. The attitude of the Government in deciding to summon the States-General was a confession of failure on the part of an institution hitherto regarded by the majority as not merely omnipotent, but omniscient —which is much more. In 1788 the Government turned to the French people, and, pointing to the crisis by which it was confronted, said in effect— "We give it up; what do you think about it?"

For a people at once so idealistic and so practical as the French the question could have but one reply. Reform was imperative, but the old order contained no organs by which reform could be made effective, and a thousand vested interests—social, political and economic—which would offer resistance to change. From such an impasse there was no escape but a revolution—a "sudden and violent reversion to the normal"—for which by the doctrines of her philosophers, and of Rousseau above all, the mind of France was already prepared. This abstract conclusion might have remained with another people a thing academic; the French added to it a passionate faith in the conquests which Liberty and Reason might achieve and the immense vigour of their national temperament. It is to these causes that we must attribute the fact that the revolution for which all Europe was waiting began

in a country which had long enjoyed the intellectual hegemony of the Continent, and which was enabled by its centralisation to make changes swiftly and decisively, and defeating every effort of reaction, to spread its doctrines like a flame.

Even before this direct challenge, there had been ominous signs of trouble.[1] From 1775 to 1777 the country districts had been in a condition of spasmodic insurrection, due to famine. The houses of corn monopolists were wrecked and bakeries looted, and there began to appear that beginning of the flood of pamphlets and papers that presaged and accompanied the Revolution. The riots died down for a few years, only to break out with renewed and increasing fury in 1782, and continued right up to the calling of the Estates-General. The French Government was already nearly bankrupt, the revolts made it impossible to collect the taxes. Eventually, Louis XVI was forced to convoke the Estates-General for May 1, 1789.[2]

This body consisted of representatives of three "Estates": the clergy, the nobility, and the Third Estate. This latter, which alone had any democratic right to exist, was about equal in number to the other two orders combined (clergy 293, nobles 289, Third Estate 595), and it was expected that the Orders would sit together. The Third Estate was almost purely middle-class, as witness its composition. It contained 365 lawyers of various kinds; 179 of its members were more or less directly dependent on the Government; merchants, mayors, landlords, etc., numbered 142, and even if the heading "Cultivators . . . 40" covers a few members of the poorer classes they had little influence on its debates[3]. They brought with them the *Cahiers*—lists of grievances and reforms demanded in their constituencies.[4] These may be held to represent more closely the opinions of the peasantry.

The King almost immediately quarrelled with this body, which he might so easily have conciliated. He made it clear, through his Keeper of the Seals, Barentin, that the Estates were only required to vote taxes, assent to a few small reforms which he desired and check the licence of the Press. He desired the Orders to sit separately. The Third Estate perceived ruin and bankruptcy ahead unless the Government was renovated, and its idealists, fed by the rain of pamphlets, as well as by the philosophers, were shocked at the King's obstinate refusal to conform to their libertarian ideas. It made efforts to induce the other Orders to sit with it, and on June 17 declared itself the "National Assembly." The Court prepared a counterstroke—the King should go in State, annul the acts of the "Assembly," and order the separation of the Orders. Before he could do this, the Assembly, finding the doors of its usual meeting-place closed, adjourned to the Tennis Court in the Rue St. François, Versailles, and there took the oath (Document 2), which amounted to a solemn and direct challenge to the King. When, on the 23rd, he delivered his prepared speech, refusing concessions, commanding the

[1] It is obvious that a complete history of the French Revolution is impossible here. This short account, therefore, has had to be strictly confined to the most important incidents, and will omit, for example, the military and clerical history, which are both of the gravest importance.

[2] It met actually on May 5.

[3] See the invaluable *Liste Complette de Messieurs les Députés*. (British Museum F 828 (3).)

[4] See above, p. 8.

division of the Orders, and, finally, desiring the members to leave the hall, the Third Estate "sat tight," and in a few days the other Orders began to join it. Louis found that his soldiers would not fire on the people, Paris was nearly in insurrection, and eventually he himself requested the recalcitrant nobles to join the Third Estate. The Revolution had begun.

The Court was not prepared to yield without a struggle, however. Louis' entourage, no doubt with his consent, planned to call Marshal Broglie to Paris, with approximately 30,000 men[1], dissolve the Third Estate, and imprison its chief members. While the Assembly was uneasily voting flattering addresses to the King, asking him to withdraw the troops from the capital and its immediate neighbourhood, the people of Paris itself took action which saved the Revolution. The Paris Districts were strongly organised and armed. Already they had started burning the toll-gates, and hunger was increasing every day. When it was heard, on July 12, that Louis had dismissed his Finance Minister, Necker, the unworthy idol of the populace, the anger of the people led to firing in the streets of Paris. The next day the Prison of La Force was seized, and on the 14th, the people, after a severe struggle, stormed the Bastille, the great fortress and prison in the Faubourg St. Antoine. This victory of the people entirely discomfited the Court, and henceforward the Assembly was no longer in hourly fear of dissolution, but knew that the force upon which it could rely was greater than the King's. All over the country followed insurrection: the peasants ceased paying feudal dues, destroyed the deeds, and in some cases the châteaux of the oppressive lords were fired. Feudal society began rapidly to fall in pieces.

The Court and nobility, thus suddenly thrown upon the defensive, sought to save something at least from the wreckage. Observing that their feudal dues were already disappearing, certain members of the nobility, on the night of August 4, proposed to the Assembly to abandon in principle all feudal rights: to abolish personal servitude at once and *redeem* most other rights. The Assembly, overjoyed, accepted this sacrifice at its face value, not realising that the nobility was making the best of a bad job. A fashionable doctor from England, Jean Paul Marat, who had joined the party of the extreme Left, was one of the very few who noted its illusory character (Document 3). And so unpopular was his view that his pamphlet could not be printed till September 21. Fortunately, however, the effort of the nobles was vain. All that the peasant knew or cared to know was that the Assembly had declared the feudal rights destroyed. Henceforward no exactions were paid: the Lord was lucky if his château remained intact; and there began that great stream of emigration of the nobility which so seriously alarmed the revolutionaries. The great majority of the nobles, including the King's brothers, crossed the frontier to Coblentz and elsewhere to form groups which continually incited and prepared war against and inside France. Their numbers and influence were not large, but they created a very real

[1] Dumouriez, *Mémoires*, ii, 35.

fear in Paris and entirely disorganised the upper ranks of the army. Mirabeau (Document 8) for the moment protected their interests, and no action was taken against them. All the same, their flight destroyed the feudal system yet more irreparably.

However little the Assembly had anticipated the capture of the Bastille, it was not loth to profit by it. A few days after its fall there began the discussion of the document which was to state the fundamental principles of the Revolution—the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen (Document 5). This was, perhaps, the Assembly's last unanimous act—certainly its most important one. A modern reader must remember that each of its provisions, which seem to him so dull and obvious, was then a violent and daring assertion of principles destructive of the constituted authorities of all Europe. There is scarcely a phrase which was not a revolutionary challenge, yet the document was adopted with practical unanimity. The mere fact that its provisions seem dull to us to-day shows how thoroughly the French Revolution did its work and how deeply we are indebted to it. The document before us is, it is true, not in any way Socialist, nor could it be. But it enunciated the principles of the destruction of that caste system which forbade any progress of any kind: it is the chief monument of the first phase of the age-long revolution which is leading us to Socialism.

The Court appreciated its revolutionary character, and the King steadily refused to sign it. Issue was now joined on a point of principle. Unfortunately, there was every sign that the Crown would triumph. The Assembly was by no means a body prepared for vigorous revolutionary action: one-third of its deputies were ready to come to terms with the King; while the Queen and the Court were resuming their intrigues for the forcible suppression of Paris. Their activities, however, began to force the moderates to turn openly to the Paris Faubourgs for support. Famine and bankruptcy were very near, and exacerbated the wrath of the people at the holding up of the Declaration, "the desired of all France," as Marat (p. 26) called it. The Paris "Districts" were by now sufficiently organised to be a formidable military force, and the news of a particularly flagrant anti-popular demonstration at Versailles (detailed in Document 4) moved them to action. On October 4 the extreme revolutionaries, particularly Danton, Marat and Loustallot, attempted to rouse the people to action in the sense indicated by the Cordeliers manifesto (p. 29). The next day a great procession of women marched upon Versailles, expressing open hatred of the Queen. Some men followed, and Lafayette with his National Guard, hoping to save the palace from ruin. The crowd occupied the palace without much difficulty and without bloodshed; for some hours the Court and Royal Family were in agonies of apprehension. The King was brought to Paris to the Tuileries, where he immediately called for the history of Charles I from his library. The Declaration was signed and the Royalist *coup de main* forestalled.[1]

[1] The proposal had been that the King should retire to Metz, place himself at the head of an army and dissolve the Assembly. We must beware of assuming a continuous enmity at this time between the people and the King. The people felt they had brought home "their King" and saved him from evil counsellors. The King was still an inert mass, pushed and pulled in a certain direction by the Queen and the Court. His active hostility begins with the Civil Constitution. See next note.

With this victory, it was universally anticipated, the Revolution would triumph. The Assembly, before moving to Paris, decreed the responsibility of Ministers and of officials and the assessment of all taxes by itself. It provided for the urgent needs of the State by a necessary measure of confiscation—the seizure of Church lands (Document 6).[1]

In spite of appearances, however, the years 1790-1 were years of comparative reaction, particularly in Paris. The members of the professions and the upper middle class in the Assembly were in no sense Republicans. They believed that they had attained their aim of a constitutional monarchy free of the embarrassments of feudal restrictions and expenses. Their leader, Mirabeau, was, without their knowledge, in the pay of the Court, though never one of its tools. They regarded, or rather wished to regard, their opposition to the King as over, and had no intention of realising any of the principles of the Declaration of Rights, or of conceding to the poorer classes any real "Liberty and Equality." The Paris Districts were abolished, martial law was proclaimed in Paris, the Press was muzzled, and Lafayette, with his middle-class National Guard, inaugurated a system of pitiless and rigid policing of Paris, which, it was believed, would prevent any further outbursts by the "mob." The Assembly had already sanctioned a far more serious reactionary proposal. It had agreed to destroy universal suffrage, by which it had been—indirectly—itself elected. The body of citizens were divided into "active" and "passive" members: the former were alone possessed of the right to vote, and were made up of those citizens who paid in direct taxes the value of "three days' work." The qualifications for members of the Assembly were still more exclusive. By this means the lower classes were excluded from their political rights just when they believed they had secured them. This measure, which eventually saw the light as the "Constitution of 1791," was if anything made more undemocratic in its final form.

Two factors, however, were acting against the realisation of their hopes. The first was the Crown—or, perhaps, it is truer to say the Queen and her entourage. They were quite glad to see the Assembly attacking the revolutionary forces, and intrigued to subjugate its individual members more completely to reactionary influences. But at the same time they were continually plotting to restore the old autocracy by a military stroke. Marat—in an unusually violent pamphlet (Document 7), for which he was driven into hiding—denounces their plots with singular accuracy. While Mirabeau was alive, the link with the Assembly held: soon after his death the breach became inevitable.

On the other hand, the Assembly's attempt at repression did not succeed.

[1] The ecclesiastical history of the Revolution would require a separate book. This particular measure was due to the fact that the higher clergy were unbelieving and immoral, excessively wealthy, and pastors of a dwindling flock. This measure of confiscation excited neither surprise nor indignation; but it was followed in 1792 by the Civil Constitution, which broke the connection with the Pope and made the appointment of the clergy dependent upon bodies consisting mainly of unbelievers. This was followed by the requirement to take the oath to the Constitution, in which this measure was incorporated. Thus the hostility of the upper clergy and the Orders, which proceeded mainly from base motives, was reinforced by the bitter enmity of every deeply religious priest. Each earnest *curé* became a centre of revolt; the Vendéan and other insurrections were sustained by them and a just feeling against the Revolution began to arise in certain circles which was sufficiently strong to afford support and cover to the various interests opposed to the Revolution. See H. Belloc: *The French Revolution*, pp. 234, *et sqq.*

The organisation by "sections," which was substituted for the Districts, became an even more supple instrument of revolution, and the corporate body of the sections formed the Paris Commune, which is henceforward the real organ of revolution, which urges on, and if necessary forces on, the hesitating Assemblies. The Commune, by its Feast of Federation, emphasised and strengthened its connection with similar bodies all over France.

The attempt of the Assembly to arrest the Revolution at the point which suited it, continued right through 1791. Advantage was taken of the lull in peasant insurrections to pass enactments which forced the peasant to pay the seigneurial dues which he imagined had been abolished. The redemption in full of all these rights was to be enforced, and if the lord could show proof of possession for thirty years he could reinforce the rights which his peasants had forced him to renounce in the autumn of 1789. Writs and summonses poured in thousands upon the villages, and soon revived the civil war and burning of châteaux.[1] The municipalities and the Assembly took violent action; punitive expeditions against the peasants were sent out and Draconian laws passed against them. The Court at the same time took action to drive out the revolutionary spirit in the Army. In August, 1790, the Swiss regiments at Nancy demanded the accounts of the regiment from their officers, in virtue of a decree of the Assembly. They quickly submitted to discipline again and signed a deed of repentance: this was not the desire of the Court: Marshal Bouillé attacked Nancy, massacred the garrison and civilians as well; and received the thanks of the King and the Assembly. Reaction was in power.

Under this regime, however, was completed a reform which was a necessary part of the Revolution.[2] On March 2, 1791, all the old Guilds, and medieval restrictions resulting from them, were abolished. The importance of this is obvious: although it was to a large extent merely a recognition of accomplished fact, it was necessary in order to clear the field for the growth of capitalism. It was the counterpart in the towns of the decree of August 4. The Assembly made it clear, however, that it passed this law only for its own advantage by the enactment of the Loi Chapelier (Document 9) a few weeks later. This Act, which prohibited Trade Associations, is more important for the later history of French Trade Unions than for the present period, although it sheds a singular light upon the mentality of the Assembly. It was due to the concerted demand of many Paris journeymen upon their masters for an increase of wages. But it should be observed that the resistance to the decree was of the smallest. French industry was still half-medieval, and its typical worker was the hand-loom weaver. It was not prepared for a Trade Union movement as we understand it, and it is very dangerous to read this Act as though it applied to modern conditions.

The insecure tyranny of the Assembly and the upper classes received its first serious shock from the King himself. The plans of Marie Antoinette for evasion were complete by June, 1791. The King was to escape to the

[1] See Kropotkin: *The Great French Revolution*, ch. 26–28.
[2] See Document 9 with note *ad loc.* on its justification in political theory.

Eastern frontiers, place himself at the head of the regular army, the émigrés and probably some foreign auxiliaries, return to Paris, dissolve the Assembly, punish the revolutionaries, and restore the old regime. The King escaped as far as Varennes, where he was stopped, on June 20, 1791, by the exertions of an obscure ex-postmaster, Drouet. He was taken back to Paris under escort.

The flight of the King—his refusal to play the part that they had assigned to him—appalled the Constitutional Monarchists of the Assembly. In his absence, the Assembly had to take over the government, thereby proving how socially useless a king was. The towns of France, especially Paris, became the scene of an openly Republican movement for the first time. The extreme Left, as for example, the Cordeliers Club (Document 10) initiated this movement: the Jacobins gave it hesitating patronage.

In alarm, the Assembly retraced its footsteps, and issued on July 15 a decree which declared the King innocent and confirmed him upon his throne. However, the reactionaries were not at all certain of their position, as is shown by the foundation of the Feuillants Club in the same month. And only two days after the Assembly's decree a vast crowd assembled in the Champs de Mars to sign a Republican petition (Document 11) which stated clearly their unassailable position. They were most wantonly and unjustifiably set upon by Lafayette and the National Guard, and a massacre followed. A month later (Document 12) was issued the famous Declaration of Pillnitz. This was a document published by the Emperor and the King of Prussia—it must be read in full to be appreciated—which was an open warning to the revolutionaries that if they proceeded in their activities they would have to meet invasion by the whole of Europe. It was the first and most surprising instance of that foreign provocation which forced upon the Revolution its military character. It was issued in connivance with the French Court.

By these means Louis was again seated upon his throne, and on September 29 the Constituent Assembly dissolved to make room for the Legislative Assembly, elected under the restricted suffrage of the Constitution of 1791. Through all this time famine continued, and conditions were particularly trying this winter. The treason of the Court had been checked only temporarily. Marat and Danton were in hiding, and most of the revolutionaries regarded their cause as lost. The Court was in continual communication with the émigrés and the fear of foreign invasion was in everyone's mind.

The new Assembly was controlled by a "Centre party" which was more revolutionary than the Feuillants Club, since it was not monarchist in principle, but merely supported Louis as a temporary policy. Since its chief members came from the Gironde, they were called Girondins. Vergniaud and Guadet were their chief orators, Brissot and Madame Roland their actual leaders. They were cultured and well-to-do persons, devoted to their ideals, possessed of personal courage and eloquence. They were utterly

incapable of guiding and directing the Revolution or of voicing and understanding the popular movement. They were essentially "of the governing classes," and were as ruthless in their enactments as the Jacobins. Carlyle says well of them: "There is a class of Revolutionists named Girondins whose fate in history is remarkable enough. Men who rebel, and urge the lower classes to rebel, ought to have other than formulas to go upon. Men who discern in the misery of the toiling complaining millions, not misery but only a raw material which can be wrought upon and in for one's own poor hidebound theories and egoisms, to whom millions of living fellow-creatures with beating hearts in their bosoms—beating, suffering, hoping—are 'masses,' mere explosive masses, for blowing down Bastilles with, for voting at hustings for 'us,' such men are of the questionable species."

They were, further, obsessed by purely political questions. For them the chief object was the proclamation of the Republic—or even merely the placing of true Republicans (themselves) in power. They were indifferent to and ignorant of the social demands of the Revolution. At the moment these were three: the final abolition of the feudal dues without redemption, without which the peasant revolutionary was threatened by a continual danger of their re-infliction; the recognition of the right of the village communes to the land they had resumed from the lords; the fixing of a maximum price for foodstuffs. Concerning all these the Girondins remained silent, or repeated parrot-like the formula "Property is sacred." Their opponents, the Jacobins, or, as they were called, "The Mountain," only slowly began to advocate these measures: they were in any case in a tiny minority in the Legislative. They gained strength and their programme became more defined as time passed; their attitude is in a sense negative, it is outlined by their opposition to the series of disastrous blunders of which the Gironde was guilty.

Its first and greatest blunder, which very nearly drowned the Revolution in a sea of blood, was the declaration of war with Austria (which led to war with Prussia) on April 21, 1792. This they did, not only because they were inspired by an unreflecting enthusiasm for a crusade for liberty, but also because they feared to appeal to the Paris *sans-culottes* to rise against the King, whom they distrusted, and hoped that a foreign invasion would arouse patriotic feeling and expose his treason. "We want some great treachery," said Brissot. Their theoretic reasoning neglected the fact that the whole of the old army was practically without its officers, was disorganised and incapable of fighting, that the new army did not exist. It was not until the summer that the German armies began to move. When they did the folly of the Girondin action was fully shown. Not only was the Crown, the executive power, in communication and alliance with the invaders, but the French forces were incapable of offering any resistance to the Germans. However great their numerical superiority, they were always shamefully defeated. Fortress after fortress fell, and in August it was clear that it was only a question of weeks before the invaders reached Paris—to burn, massacre and destroy, as the Duke of Brunswick had announced in a proclamation

inspired by Marie Antoinette. The Royalist conspirators all over Franc were well provided with arms and money, while the poverty-stricke popular societies had nothing to oppose to them but words; consequently, i 1791 and 1792 we find Royalist insurrections in Perpignan, Arles, Lozèr the Vivarais, Yssingeaux in Haute Loire. In the Vendée, by the use c religious feeling,[1] the Royalists were able to begin a ferocious and successfu revolt, which, failing at the moment, revived and spread continually an threatened at last to engulf the Republican forces altogether. Such were th results of the Gironde's first act of statesmanship. In anticipation of complet success the King dismissed his Girondin Ministry on June 13. His confi dence was only increased by the failure of a popular demonstration o June 20.

The Paris Commune, as before, saved the situation. The petition to th Assembly (Document 13), which sets forth the situation very justly, receive no adequate reply, and various other indications showed that the Assembl would not move, although it might be prepared to profit by the Commune' action. The army was even less useful; Lafayette had already offered th King "his" army to crush the Jacobins. The Assembly had absolved him Hence, on the exhortation of Robespierre and other Jacobins, the rea leaders of the people, Danton, Marat, Hebert, Chaumette, etc., formed new Revolutionary Commune, appointed by the sections, and brough about an armed attack upon the Tuileries on August 10. The palace wa captured, its guards slain after a fierce struggle, Louis had already fled to th Assembly, which no longer feared to pronounce his suspension. Under th direct impulsion of the victorious Commune, the Assembly suddenly passe several of the laws the Left had demanded. The lands of the émigrés were confiscated to be sold in small lots. (They were, in fact, owing to the immediat need of money sold far more frequently in large estates.) Universal suffrag was at last decreed. The Assembly also passed the decree on communal land (Document 14), which was at that time quite useless. No machinery was eve provided for its execution; it enforced division even against the will of th peasants, and the vagueness of its terms was tantamount to issuing no decre at all.

In the new Ministry the great Jacobin administrator, Danton, had taken practical charge of the conduct of the war. Nevertheless, no man can improvise an army, and the steady, relentless success of the Prussians and Austrians continued. The imprisoned Royalists, seized after August 10, openly calculated on the enemy's arrival in Paris on September 5. The great fortress of Verdun fell on August 19 without a struggle, Lafayette went over to the enemy on the same day, and it seemed that for Dumouriez' troops to meet the enemy was to invite a scandalous defeat. The exasperation of fear that resulted, together with the refusal of the Courts to take any action against the conspirators who had betrayed Dumouriez' plans to Austria and assisted the invader in every way that their high place and unlimited opportunity

[1] See p. 14

uld suggest, led to the September massacres. On September 2 and 3, out 300 armed men, inspired by Marat and supported by the Paris crowd, oke into the prisons and slew the Royalists therein. Generally, no doubt, ese were very guilty, but they were not given anything in the nature of a ir trial. They were, in fact, murdered; but their murderers had at once nturies of wrongs and immediate treason to avenge. Neither Hebert nor anton[1] was concerned in it, nor any other public men except Marat and anis, although generally the murders were felt to be justified. Roland, the irondin, called them "a wild justice." However this may be, these massacres d the Terror are the natural result of the extreme suffering and fear of the ople, and it must be admitted that such suffering and fear have always oduced the same result.

On September 20, 1792, the Legislative Assembly made way for its mocratic successor, the National Convention. On the same day the Prussian my, owing apparently to a mere accident,[2] failed to break the French line Valmy; and, to the world's stupefaction and his own, the Duke of Brunsick began to retreat, negotiated, and at last left France altogether. By sheer accident, the Revolution was given a breathing-space; as an offset, owever, owing to the needs of the war, famine and also unemployment ere excessively bad in the winter of 1792-3.

In the Convention were three divisions—The Mountain, The Plain, he Gironde. The Plain was composed of men without settled conviction, ho adhered to the party in power without showing initiative of any kind. t was otherwise called the Marsh,[3] and its component members called the rogs. The Jacobins, or Mountain, had naturally found their numbers reatly increased, but were still in a minority, and the Girondins controlled e Convention as before. The Commune outside, which was deeply suspiious of the Convention and regarded the Revolution as its own work, was ltra-Jacobin. All parties united in declaring Royalty abolished on eptember 21.

The early months of 1793 are filled with the history of the struggle etween the Gironde and the Mountain. The Gironde believed that after ugust 10 the Revolution should have come to a complete stop, and that the rther measures which were proposed, and which represented the real needs f the people, were the proposals of "anarchy" and to be "repressed." In this lea they were supported by a new and growing class of men who had made ersonal gain out of the Revolution and desired to retain it; traders who fished troubled waters, *accapareurs*, the many people who profited by the mine, the rich peasant, etc. The phenomena of stock-jobbing, speculating ith the depreciated paper-money, "forestalling and regrating," and so on, ere an astonishment to the *sans-culotte* when practised and defended in the ame of the Republic. Hence, the Jacobins particularly demanded such

1 I am aware that in saying this I am making a controversial statement, but here, as elsewhere, e exigencies of space force me merely to state my opinion of the outcome of a long controversy. ee for this point Belloc's *Danton*.

2 See Belloc: *The Last Days of the French Monarchy*, p. 190.

3 Or even "The Belly."

economic measures as the fixing of maximum prices for food and the completion of the agricultural revolution, and, eventually, vigorous action against the persons of the speculative class. We must, however, beware of calling the Mountain a Communist party. The speeches of Danton and Robespierre (Nos. 15 and 17), particularly the latter, show this clearly. The Jacobins were forced by the logic of events into limiting and attacking the rights of property, even while they disclaimed any desire to do so on principle. Outside the Assembly was a third party, with which the Jacobins threatened the Gironde when it suited them—the party of the men who took the Bastille and the Tuileries, the *Enragés* as they were called. They were the party of "direct action": the extreme Left and the fighting force of the movement. Their organ was the Paris Commune; their leaders were Chaumette, Hebert and Marat. In the writings of the last two, rather than in set speeches of the Assembly, must we look for the real thoughts of the *sans-culotte* and the true voice of the common revolutionary. Jean Paul Marat, once a fashionable and wealthy doctor, a distinguished man of science and an opponent of Newton, was one of those to whom the Revolution had become the sole inspiration of their life. His devotion was that of a fanatic, and grew in fierceness as time went on. In this he represented truly the *sans-culotte*, as also in his personal kind-heartedness, and his extreme but nearly always justified suspiciousness. He reflected their mentality also in his violence, which in the end grew outrageous, under the influence of a malignant disease which gave him no rest.[1] If Marat instructed the people, Jacques Réné Hebert, on the other hand, never produced an original or illuminating idea in all his life.[2] He was an able journalist and no doubt a sincere revolutionist, but confined himself to echoing the sentiments of the *sans-culottes*, and underlining and increasing their fierceness. His excessive violence, which has not Marat's excuse of extreme and flaming devotion, disgusted and disgusts many; yet his very paucity of ideas makes him the more trustworthy as a mirror His *Père Duchesne* was written deliberately in the language and with the oaths of the *sans-culottes*, and we may observe that all French revolutions since then have produced their *Père Duchesne*.[3] The division between the Jacobins proper and the Commune did not become obvious till after the fall of the Gironde. For the minute the latter was content to appear as the instrument of the former.

The effect of the "fluke" of Valmy was quickly over, and the Gironde was faced with an even gloomier military situation when the invasion was resumed. Fortunately, the brilliant skill of their general, Dumouriez, was able to counteract the poor quality of his army, and on November 6 he entirely

[1] Observe in this connection, Document 7. This was singularly violent for Marat, in his early days, yet when he corrected it later it will be seen in each case he increased its violence. Probably he was not entirely sane in his last days.

[2] Except, oddly enough, on Education. See G. Tridon: *Les Hebertistes*, p. 65.

[3] Its chief characteristic—after brutality—is its strength of joy or wrath—even after all these years the *Grande Colère* and *Grande Joie* of Father Duchesne are exhilarating. Hebert can also be very charming if he desires—take, for example, his Supper with Jean Bar. (No. 4.) The " père Duchesne " is a typical figure of popular mythology: he is a *marchand des fourneaux* and smokes and swears freely. The *Père Duchesne* of 1848 had even offspring, the Bonapartist *Petit fils du Père Duchesne*. Under the Commune Vermersch, Humbert and Vuillaume ran a *Père Duchesne* of which the last-named gives a charming account in his *Cahiers rouges*. Someone started a *Père Duchesne Illustré* in 1879, but such strong meat is only palatable in time of revolution. G. Maroteau had made a similar attempt in 1869.

defeated the Austrians at Jemmappes, a victory which led to the occupation of Belgium and the opening of the Scheldt, which, in its turn, led to war with England. For the minute, however, the Gironde had the advantage of the prestige of victory.

This they speedily lost. They remained hostile to a strong executive in the name of liberty—at a time when parts of the provinces were in open or secret revolt, and the Vendéan insurrection was becoming a devouring and permanent war. In pursuit of the same chimera of federalism (local autonomy) they showed hostility to the Paris Commune, whose powers they were anxious to destroy, in the name of liberty again—a process no doubt justifiable in theory but suicidal in a time of revolution. Finally, their demand for "Order" hardened; they refused to grant any of the desires of the people, and remained the protectors of their middle-class exploiters. Their administrative failure eventually assured the victory of the Mountain, but before that they were able to begin the system of the Terror by the institution of the Revolutionary Tribunal on March 10, 1793. This was similar to a declaration of martial law; and at the same time the Gironde decreed death against all who proposed an "agrarian law or any other law subversive of territorial, commercial or industrial property," or "provoked by their writings . . . violation of property." The Mountain adopted and extended this savage system, but at least turned it to better uses.

In spite, however, of their faults, the Girondins lived on by the prestige of military success. Quickly they lost this when Dumouriez, their chosen hero, met defeat at Neerwinden on March 18, lost Belgium again, and a week later deserted to the enemy. He had been so much the chosen man of the Gironde that it was as though the party itself was implicated. The Jacobins inspired a great movement to obtain recruits, but at the same time denounced the incompetence and folly of the Gironde. The manifesto of April 13 (Document 16) was tantamount to an open declaration of their intention to purge the Convention. The Gironde, already tottering to its fall, replied on May 18 by an attempt (Document 18) to destroy the organ of revolution, the Paris Commune. Meanwhile, revolt was spreading all over France, the armies were once again in retreat, and, in order to meet this danger, the Convention instituted two Committees—the Committee of Public Safety (*Salut Public*) and that of General Security (*Sûreté Générale*). The latter was chiefly concerned with the State police; the former, acting with it, practically took over the functions of the Convention and controlled the Executive. It justified its existence by its success.

The proposal of the Gironde to suppress the Commune was modified into the appointment of a Commission of Twelve to examine into the Commune's decisions. This Commission arrested Hebert, deputy procurator of the Commune and the idol of the *Enragés*. At the same time the Gironde had howled down Chaumette's proposal for heavy taxation of the wealthy. The Girondin Isnard, then president of the Convention, threatened to destroy Paris so that "people should search on the banks of the Seine to see if it had ever existed."

The people of Paris rose on May 31 and again on June 2, and secured the expulsion and arrest of thirty-one Girondin leaders. Henceforward the Jacobins control the Convention, and the middle-class predominance is broken. The crime of the Gironde had been not only that they had helped to instigate a war they were incompetent to wage, but that they were satisfied with a purely political Republic; they protected the *accapareur* and exploiter, and resisted all economic change as anarchy. The task of the Jacobins was, firstly, to defend the Revolution against external enemies; secondly, to complete the economic side of the Revolution at home. In the first they succeeded brilliantly, in the second not so well.

Their social policy on the most important question—the land—is shown in Documents 19 and 21. By these documents it will be seen the feudal system was at length wiped out altogether and the right of the villages to their communal lands, seized by the lords, at last recognised. These lands, under the old Government, might, perhaps, have been sold to the wealthier peasants; under a Communist government they would have been declared common land. But the Mountain was not a Communist government; it was attempting to realise "Social Equality" while retaining property as an institution—entirely a hopeless task, no doubt, but in this attempt they did much of real and lasting value to the workers.

The maximum price for all foodstuffs,[1] a crying need of the starving people, was enforced, taxation was made to bear very heavily upon the rich; laws were passed which forced the division of fortunes at death; feudal dues were suppressed, as we have seen, without compensation. On the other hand, the national estates, which were to have been sold in small lots, were sold generally to any one who could afford to buy them, and in large parcels, owing to the great need of ready money. Thus, the Jacobins, with each sale, raised up recruits for the Gironde and reinforced the very class it was fighting. It made vain the Constitution of 1793, the "Palladium of Democracy," which remained for ever a paper constitution.

The war it continued with startling success. The Gironde avenged itself by joining with the Royalists in insurrection, and the Convention was soon faced with widespread and incessant insurrection of a kind which was far more serious than hitherto. Marseilles, Lyons, Toulon[2] all rose against the Republic. They were eventually crushed, and the foreign invader victoriously repelled, but not without a stiffening of the Terror, that system of martial law which the Gironde had begun, and some appalling severities in the provinces. Almost immediately after the fall of the Gironde Marat was murdered, and it is important to observe the fear and fury with which Hebert relates this (Document 20). His mood was typical of all France at this time. Not only was the position nearly desperate, and only saved by the genius and energy of the Great Committees, and their pitiless severity, but in Marat's death the Left suffered an irreparable loss. No one ever arose again who had his keen grasp of affairs and his incisive understanding.

[1] And many secondary necessities.

[2] The Gironde and the Royalists united in attacking the Republic by revolt; if they had succeeded, the triumph of the Gironde and the life of the Republic would both have been short.

The real ruler of France in this period was the Committee, and the accepted head of the Committee was Robespierre. Robespierre (Document 17) was anti-Communist, and was aiming at the establishment by violence of an ideal Republic of Virtue and conducting a strange and incongruous propaganda of Deism which excited the contempt of Hebert and others. He consented at least to the ever-increasing rigour of the Terror. The internal policy of the country was largely in his hands, and under him it was turned to minor matters—the revolutionary calendar, the metric system, the cult of Reason, etc.

The Left, in the Commune, was still faced with the death penalty on all Communist speeches, and thus we find that they were confined to violent denunciation of the exploiters. The *Père Duchesne*, No. 279 (Document 22) is but a specimen of a large and rather monotonous literature. There were, no doubt, certain Communist speakers, but they remained obscure, and if they did not, were slain by the Committee, and certain Communist proposals which remained unfruitful. Had a leader arisen and been permitted to speak, a Communist movement would probably have arisen. But the Revolution was suffering from a lack of men. It was slaying too much to be provided with able and devoted statesmen. No man but Hebert was left to lead such a party. Hebert was incapable. And the vigorous prosecution of the land settlement made "the agrarian law" no longer a popular cry.

But the Revolution must either go forward or collapse. Encouraged by their continual military successes, the Committee resolved, not to stop the Terror, but to free themselves of their critics of the Commune. In March, 1794, the Commune was suppressed; Hebert failed to raise an insurrection; and he and his followers were guillotined on March 24 (4th Germinal), 1794. With him, an unworthy representative, perished the driving force of the Revolution. To slay its own Left is a disastrous procedure for a revolutionary party; and next the Committee had to turn its attention to the Right —the "worn-outs" as it called them—Danton and his friends, who were guilty of demanding the cessation of this mad race of blood (Document 23). Danton, Desmoulins and others met an ill-deserved death on April 5.

The slaughter went on in ever-growing numbers. But Paris and everybody was sickened by it; the victory of the Republican armies deprived it of its sole excuse. On July 27 (9th Thermidor), amid general relief, Robespierre was guillotined and the Committee soon afterwards overturned. Here stopped the Revolution inside France. With Robespierre's fall the bourgeois re-entered into his former place.

The relief which greeted the fall of the Mountain was unjustified; Robespierre's death was the signal for a White Terror which equalled the Red Terror in fury without its excuse. The maximum was abolished; starvation and crises ensued; manhunts and massacres of revolutionaries began in the South; worst of all, corruption and wealth seized hold of the Government. The Constitution of 1793 was destroyed and a new one excluding the workers enacted, and so on. Fortunately, it is not necessary for us to follow this degrading period in detail.

After two vain revolts of the starving and cheated Parisians in 1795, François Noel Babeuf, or, as he called himself, Gracchus Babeuf, was preparing another revolt in 1796, when he was arrested, and executed in May, 1797. For the exact type of Communism which he desired, and which later inspired the Chartist leader, Bronterre O'Brien, the reader must turn to the documents (Documents 24 to 27). The surprising thing is that he was a Communist at all. This was due, as he claimed at his trial, to the fact that his movement was the logical outcome of the Revolution. In time of revolution history proceeds swiftly, and Babeuf represents a stage in evolution born out of time. His movement was due merely to a logical process of thought: "Equality is the motto of the Republic: the Jacobins failed to obtain Social Equality; therefore, we must have Communism." The contented peasants, the vast upper class which was feasting on France, and the inert and exhausted masses alike regarded him with indifference or dislike. His appeal to the soldiery (Document 26) remained fruitless; he allied himself with the politically-minded Jacobins; attempted a last struggle to save democracy and equality by the expedient outlined in Document 27; was betrayed by spies and executed.

After his death, France settled down for a while to rest. The destruction of feudalism was, after all, a great thing, and this her chosen instrument, Napoleon, spread over the face of Europe.

Bibliographical Note

It is, of course, quite impossible to attempt a complete bibliography of this period. The literature is too immense, but an indication of a few essential books may be given.

The best brief history is Hilaire Belloc's *The French Revolution* (Home University Library). The indispensable large history is A. Aulard's *Political History of the French Revolution*, which is to be found in most libraries and is the standard work upon the subject. Socialists, however, will be well advised to consult also Prince Kropotkin's *The Great French Revolution*, which is inspired by a thorough comprehension of the spirit of the revolutionaries, and, although this may sometimes colour his account, his narrative is essential for an understanding of the Revolution. The late Lord Acton's *Lectures on the French Revolution* are excellent.

Biographies are next in importance. They often give a far more living picture of the period. Most valuable are Mr. Belloc's two biographies, *Danton* and *Robespierre*, and Mr. E. B. Bax's slighter studies, *Marat the Friend of the People* and *The Last Episode of the French Revolution* (for Gracchus Babeuf).

Those who can read French can supplement this by the following works:

D. MATER: *Hebert avant le* 10 *Août*. A hostile study, but the history of the Hebertists is still unwritten.

A. LICHTENBERGER: *Le Socialisme et la Revolution Française*. This work is practically unique and is very carefully done.

J. JAURÈS: *Histoire Socialiste*, Vols. i and ii. Received very high praise from M. Aulard himself.

E. LEVASSEUR: *Histoire des classes ouvrières*, 1789-1870. Is always valuable.

A. SOREL: *Europe et La Revolution Française*. Perhaps the best general history.

The reader who still perseveres had then better refer to the bibliography of the *Cambridge Modern History*, Volume viii.

Documents

1789 May 5: Estates-General meet.
1789 June 15: Third Estate declares itself the National Assembly.
1789 June 20: It is excluded from its usual meeting-place.

2 OATH TAKEN BY THE MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ON JUNE 20, 1789, IN THE TENNIS COURT

THE National Assembly, holding that, when it has been called to settle the constitution of the Kingdom, effect the regeneration of public order, and maintain the true principles of the monarchy, nothing can prevent it from continuing its deliberations and completing the important task for which it has met, in whatever place it is forced to establish itself, and, finally, that wherever its members meet, there is the National Assembly, has decided that all the members of this Assembly shall at once take an oath never to separate, but to meet wherever circumstances dictate, until the constitution of the Kingdom and public regeneration are established and settled; and that, after the taking of the said oath, all members, and each member individually, shall confirm this irrevocable resolution with their signatures.

In the National Assembly at Versailles in the Tennis Court

1789 July 14: Fall of the Bastille
1789 August 4: Decree on Feudal rights.

3 [1] J. P. MARAT'S "AMI DU PEUPLE," NO. XI. SEPT. 21, ON THE DECREE OF AUGUST 4

DURING the four months' session of the Estates-General a thousand tiny questions have been raised, a thousand complimentary and congratulatory speeches delivered, in which the most facile Orators have exhausted all the devices of eloquence; but not one single article of the Constitution, the desired of all France, has yet been sanctioned.

It is true that the National Assembly has issued numerous petty edicts which have been extolled to heaven by pamphleteers and received enthusiastically by the least enlightened classes of the people. And the phrasing of these edicts will attract its attention again, after having already held it so long.

We must not pass lightly over these points.

In the session of August 4, "The Vicomte de Noailles, having observed that the troubles desolating France, which arose from scourges and mis-

[1] This essay, called *Projet de leurer le Peuple*, was written after the decree of August 4, but could not be published, owing to the printers' fear of Lafayette's police. It was consequently published later in two halves in Marat's ournal, the "*Ami du Peuple*, ou le *Publiciste Parisien* . . . par une Société de Patriotes et redigé par M. Marat." The motto is " Vitam impendere vero."

fortunes of all kinds, could be lightened only by palliatives and good deeds, proposed the abolition of all feudal rights over the person and the redemption of territorial rights. This Motion excited enthusiasm, which instantly swayed all hearts, and soon members were struggling for the right to speak and offer, promise and sanction their sacrifice." Therefore, the following decrees were passed: Abolition of Seigneurial Courts—Abolition of Perquisites and the Renewal of the Prohibition of Holding more than one Benefice at one time—Redemption of the Seigneurial Rights of the Clergy—Abolition of the Rights of Hunting and Fishery—Permission to every Citizen to kill all Game that injures his Property—Suppression of Warrens—Redemption of Socome Rights[1]—Abolition of Guild Masterships[2]—Abolition of Seigneurial Tithes—Abolition of Dovecots—Abolition of *main-morte* in the Jura and the Franche Comté—Abolition of all Pensions not given for proved Service—Proportional Allocation of Taxes over all Estates, to date from six months previously—Exemption from all Taxation of Artisans who have no Journeymen—Suppression of Sale and Heredity in all offices of the Judiciary—Admission of all classes of Citizens to all Ecclesiastic, Civil and Military Employment—Suspension of all Litigation concerning Seigneurial Rights until the Constitution is finished—Abolition of all the Privileges of the Provinces and their complete submission to the Laws and Taxation decreed by the Representatives of the Nation.

"Observe," we are told, "what the National Assembly has accomplished for France and all mankind, in a single session, in a single evening. A sublime effort of generosity and justice—a magnificent scene, worthy to be handed down through all generations and to serve as a model for all peoples."

Before the end of the Session, the Duc de Liancourt proposed to consecrate it by striking a Medal with this inscription: *To the Abolition of all Privileges and the perfect reunion of all the Provinces and all Citizens*; the Archbishop of Paris proposed to consecrate it by throwing himself at the foot of the Altar and by chanting a *Te Deum*, the Comte de Gouy by celebrating an annual festival.

Finally, the Comte de Lally-Tollendal proposed in the National Assembly to give Louis XVI the name of *Restorer of Public Freedom.*

So many acts of justice and benevolence, dictated by humane feeling and patriotic love, anxious only to show itself, should naturally rouse the deepest admiration in the onlookers, and at the sight of generosity continually struggling to surpass itself, enthusiasm should rise to ecstasy. Is this really so? We must not insult virtue, but neither must we be anybody's dupe. If it was benevolence that dictated these sacrifices, we must agree that it waited a long while before it spoke. What! It is by the light from the flames of their burning châteaux that they magnanimously renounce the privilege of holding in chains men who have already forcibly recovered their freedom! It is at the sight of the punishment of the robbers, peculators and satellites of despotism

[1] Obligation to grind corn at the lord's mill, etc. See *Oxford English Dictionary*, *s. v.*
[2] "Jurandes."

that they generously renounce seigneurial tithes and the right to extort money from wretches who have barely enough to live on. It is after hearing the list of the proscribed, and at the sight of the fate that awaits them, that they do us the kindness to abolish warrens and permit us to save ourselves from being eaten by wild beasts.

Well, let us admit that it was virtue that induced them to do what might so easily be ascribed to fear,[1] but we must agree that the importance of these sacrifices, so highly estimated in the first moments of delight, has been slightly exaggerated. * * *

[*Marat points out in detail that all of these sacrificed rights are either already lost or implicitly ruled out by the Constitution, which still awaits sanction.*]

Again, if we consider that most of the concessions announced can only have any effect in the distant future; that not one will promptly relieve the distress of the People and the ills of the State; if we consider that it is bread which these wretches really want; if we consider the devastation of the countryside which followed on the suppression of hunting rights; if we consider the loss of precious time in eternal debates over each separate concession, which has held up the great work of the Constitution, which alone can bring peace, confidence and credit, alone establish security and freedom to cement the public happiness, we shall deplore the action of the Estates-General in sacrificing to little matters time meant for great deeds.

1789 October: King refuses to sign the Declaration.
1789 October 4: Royalist demonstration at Versailles.

4 RESOLUTION OF THE DISTRICT OF CORDELIERS, OCTOBER 4, 1789[2]

THE district of Cordeliers, this day legally convoked and assembled for an extraordinary meeting, being informed by public papers and the reports of eye-witnesses that on Thursday the first inst. a dinner was given at Versailles in the Opera Hall by the Officers of the Gardes du Corps to the Officers of the Regiment of Flanders, to which were invited the Officers of the Trois Évêchés, Dragoons, the Swiss, Swiss Hundred, Versailles National Guard, Marshals and Provosts, forming a total of 250 guests; that after the drinking of the healths of the King, the Queen and the Dauphin (that of the Nation being omitted) the tune of "*Ô Richard! Ô mon Roi!*" was played by the band of the Regiment of Flanders; that certain grenadiers and fusiliers of the said regiments had been introduced to join with their Officers and mingle their sentiments and libations; that one Grenadier drew his sword, saying that he had badly defended his King (as

[1] I except the generous abandonment of perquisites and double benefices, of which certain generous *Curés* gave the example, also the abolition of the privileges of the towns and provinces. [Marat's note.]

[2] This is the direct prelude to the attack on Versailles next day, which undoubtedly led to the signing of the Rights of Man by the King.

hough to serve the nation were betraying the King); that the national red nd blue cockade with a narrow white ribbon was insulted; that the black nd then the white cockade was substituted, that this was openly declared he only good cockade, although the King and the National Assembly and ndeed all the kingdom have adopted the colours red, blue and white ever ince the capture of the Bastille and the arrival of the King in Paris; that such n insult to the symbol of liberty and to the nation which will defend it to the ast extremity, can only be the effect of the aristocracy whose spirit is growing nd reviving daily even in the bosom of the National Assembly. * * * Has unanimously decided:—

1 That every citizen of Paris, and indeed every resident foreigner, shall e invited again and most distinctly to keep, or assume without delay the national cockade alone of red, blue and white, to be carried on the outer edging of the hat or the buttonhole of the coat.

2 That every individual, of whatever condition or quality he be, French or foreign, passing through this district with a black or white cockade only shall be invited by the first fusilier on duty to remove it and substitute the National cockade; in case he refuses to remove the objectional decoration, he shall be taken to the District to be questioned and for the Assembly to pass provisionally the proper judgment. If the Assembly is not sitting the accused shall be taken to the Hotel de Ville before the Police Committee which shall pronounce and afterwards publish the decision.

3 That if the offender is caught repeating the offence, either by this district or [*any of*] the 59 others and proof be given he shall be accused of treason and be handed over to justice as a traitor, for his trial to take place extraordinarily and without delay.

4 That all the districts receiving this decree are invited to consider that the country is in the most terrible crisis since it is still awaiting the royal assent to its constitution, and that we must not remain a moment disarmed or disunited unless we wish to see Paris worn away by the famine, with which it is threatened either through misunderstanding or through secret intrigues, and this Capital and then all the Kingdom handed over to the horrors of a war which it is easier to prevent than carry on, but which will threaten us so long as our constitution is not accepted.

5 Finally, since any extreme calm, any indifference to the public safety, at this critical moment would be unpardonable if fatal results accrued, the district decides that Commissaries shall at once be sent to the Hotel de Ville to press the Commune to instruct the Commandant General to go to-morrow, Monday the 5th, to the King at Versailles, to demand in the name of the citizens of Paris, the prompt dismissal of the Regiment of Flanders; offering in the name of the said citizens themselves to assist their brothers at Versailles and to undertake if necessary the Castle service.

The Assembly has definitely decided that this decree be at once printed, sent to the Commune in all districts, and placarded.

(Signed) D'ANTON, *President*[1]
PARÉ, *Vice-President*
GUELLARD DUMESNIL, *Secretary*

1789 October 5: March of the women on Versailles.
1789 October 5: King signs the Declaration of the Rights of Man.

5 DECLARATION OF THE RIGHTS OF MAN AND OF CITIZENS[2] BY THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF FRANCE

THE representatives of the people of France, formed into a National Assembly, considering that ignorance, neglect, or contempt of human rights,[3] are the sole causes of public misfortunes and corruptions of Government, have resolved to set forth in a solemn declaration, these natural, imprescriptible[4] and inalienable rights: that this declaration being constantly present to the minds of the members of the body social, they may be ever kept attentive to their rights and their duties; that the acts of the legislative and executive powers of Government, being capable of being every moment compared with the end of political institutions, may be more respected; and also, that the future claims of the citizens, being directed by simple and incontestable principles, may always tend to the maintenance of the Constitution, and the general happiness.

For these reasons the National Assembly doth recognise and declare, in the presence of the Supreme Being, and with the hope of his blessing and favour,[5] the following *sacred*[6] rights of men and citizens:—

I. Men are born, and always continue, free and equal in respect of their rights. Civil distinctions, therefore, can be founded only on public utility.

II. The end of all political associations is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man; and these rights are Liberty, Property, Security, and Resistance of Oppression.

III. The Nation is essentially the source of all sovereignty; nor can any individual, or any body of men, be entitled to any authority which is not expressly derived from it.

IV. Political Liberty consists in the power of doing whatever does not injure another. The exercise of the natural rights of every man, has no other limits than those which are necessary to secure to every other man the free exercise of the same rights; and these limits are determinable only by the law.

V. The law ought to prohibit only actions hurtful to society. What is

[1] The great Danton spelt his name thus at this time.
[2] Translation is Tom Paine's. The French reads, " et du citoyen."
[3] Des droits de l'homme.
[4] Sacrés.
[5] Et sous les auspices [de l'Être Suprême].
[6] Apparently inserted by Paine.

not prohibited by the law should not be hindered; nor should any one be compelled to that which the law does not require.

VI. The law is an expression of the will of the community. All citizens have a right to concur, either personally or by their representatives, in its formation. It should be the same to all, whether it protects or punishes; and all being equal in its sight, are equally eligible to all honours, places, and employments, according to their different abilities, without any other distinction than that created by their virtues and talents.

VII. No man should be accused, arrested, or held in confinement, except in cases determined by the law, and according to the forms which it has prescribed. All who promote, solicit, execute, or cause to be executed, arbitrary orders, ought to be punished, and every citizen called upon, or apprehended by virtue of the law, ought immediately to obey, and renders himself culpable by resistance.

VIII. The law ought to impose no other penalties but such as are absolutely and evidently necessary; and no one ought to be punished, but in virtue of a law promulgated before the offence, and legally applied.

IX. Every man being presumed innocent till he has been convicted, whenever his detention becomes indispensable, all rigour to him, more than is necessary to secure his person, ought to be provided against[1] by the law.

X. No man ought to be molested on account of his opinions, not even on account of his religious opinions, provided his avowal of them does not disturb the public order established by the law.

XI. The unrestrained communication of thoughts and opinions being one of the most precious Rights of Man, every citizen may speak, write, and publish freely, provided he is responsible for the abuse of this liberty, in cases determined by the law.

XII. A public force being necessary to give security to the Rights of Men and of citizens, that force is instituted for the benefit of the community and not for the particular benefit of the persons with whom it is intrusted.

XIII. A common contribution being necessary for the support of the public force, and for defraying the other expenses of Government, it ought to be divided equally among the members of the community, according to their abilities.

XIV. Every citizen has a right, either by himself or his representative, to a free voice in determining the necessity of public contributions, the appropriation of them, and their amount, mode of assessment, and duration.

XV. Every community has a right to demand of all its agents an account of their conduct.

XVI. Every community in which a separation of powers and a security of rights is not provided for, wants a Constitution.

XVII. The right to property being inviolable and sacred, no one ought to be deprived of it, except in cases of evident public necessity, legally ascertained, and on condition of a previous just indemnity.

[1] Sévèrement reprimée.

6 DECREE CONFISCATING CHURCH LANDS, NOVEMBER 2, 1789

1 The National Assembly declares that all ecclesiastical property is at the disposal of the nation, with the charge of providing in a suitable manner for the expenses of worship, support of ministers and relief of the poor, under the surveillance and following the instructions of the Provinces.

2 That in the measures to be taken to provide for the support of ministers of religion, livings must be of not less than 1,200 livres per annum, exclusive of house and gardens therewith.[1]

7 J. P. MARAT: "C'EN EST FAIT DE NOUS"

["To Arms, or] we are Lost."[2]

I KNOW there is a price on my head, set by the rescals who are at the head of affairs of State; five hundred spies seek for me night and day; well, if they find me and hold me they will cut my throat, and I shall die a martyr for liberty; it shall not be said that the country is dying and the Friend of the People has kept a cowardly silence.

M. Massot-Grand Maison has declared to the Inquiry Committee of the Municipality that he has copied *from the very manuscript of M. Maillebois*, the following project of counter-revolution:—

"*An enlightened soldier* offers his services to the Count of Artois to help him to return to France in a manner suitable to his dignity (unless the prince has other views). This soldier, who holds it possible, proposes to induce the King of Sardinia to land 25,000 soldiers and to make a loan of eight millions.

To sound the Emperor, to find out if he also has any intention of giving help of either kind.

It seems certain that the Dukes of Deux Ponts [*Zweibrücken*], the Margrave of Baden, the Landgrave of Hesse will support the plan with all their forces, since they have decided to uphold their rights in Alsace.

When this alliance is formed, the question is discussed of fabricating a manifesto in the Cabinet of the Prince, to be drawn up by MM. Mounier and Lally-Tolendall and founded on the declaration of June.

The manifesto, after revision by the soldier, is to be published before the beginning of the campaign.

They will begin by marching to Lyons, where they expect little difficulty, because of the privileges which will be previously granted to the city's commerce.

[1] The decree of August 4, beginning "The Assembly destroys entirely the feudal régime," had already confiscated the feudal revenues of the clergy. The other feudal revenues were declared redeemable merely, not abolished. Cf. Doc. 3. The constitution of the clergy, July 12, 1792, directed very largely towards the destruction of Papal power, has been found too long to summarise. The proposal which gave the most offence was that providing for the election of clergy, not by their flock, but by the population as a whole. See p. 14 and H. Belloc: *The French Revolution*, p. 234 *et sqq*.

[2] "C'en est fait de nous." No date, but really of July 26, 1790. At the end, simply "De L'imprimerie de Marat." (Printed by Marat.) In brackets are the later corrections by the hand of Marat himself. See *Revue Historique de la Revolution Française*, Oct.–Dec., 1910, pp. 549–552. I have omitted a few short notes.

Another corps d'armée to be led through Brabant.

The third to march through Lorraine.

They count on these three corps d'armée being infinitely increased by members of the anti-patriotic party.

Intrigues of adroit agents and money will gain over the troops on the frontiers.

The three corps d'armée will advance to Corbeil, Senlis and Meaux, disarm all the municipalities on or near their way, make them take an oath to the King, and force them to recall their deputies, supposing that the Estates-General continue to sit.

Paris will be blockaded and they hope thus to bring the nation back to wisdom.

[Here, then, is the wretched Desmarets ending his career as he began it, in treason and perfidy.][1]

SERIOUS DENUNCIATION OF THE MUNICIPAL INQUIRY COMMITTEE

THE imminent dangers to which the country seems exposed drag from me a denunciation which weighs on my conscience and which I have only delayed till now in the fear of not setting out the means of seizing the thread of all the black plots of the enemies of the revolution.

Therefore, I declare aloud before earth and heaven that I have full and complete knowledge of a denunciation sent about six weeks ago to the national Inquiry Committee, containing a requisition to seize the papers of two persons more than suspect, who were corresponding directly with the sometime Count of Artois and various commanders of the regular forces; as also of many other more than equivocal persons who would hold the thread of the web woven by the traitors to the nation.

I declare aloud also that I have full and complete knowledge that, to ensure the success of so important an operation, this denunciation was made in person to Mr. Garran de Coulon, who had on this subject a conference with a distinguished member of the national assembly, who was very well-informed about the matter.[2] Finally, I declare aloud, before heaven and earth, that I have full and complete knowledge that the national Inquiry Committee gave positive orders to the municipal committee to make the necessary perquisitions and seizures, orders which have been audaciously disregarded. Here I call on the municipal Inquiry Committee to come out of the darkness where it hides and reply to my denunciation. It can have disobeyed the express orders of the national assembly only because it feared to displease the Ministers, the Mayor, and the Commandant of the Paris Militia,[3] whose relations with the Court are unfortunately only too alarming, or because it is [itself] sold to the cabinet. In the first case it is guilty of criminal cowardice;

[1] This account is not imaginary. Lieutenant-General Desmarets Maillebois, and Secretary of State Guignard St. Priest were using the Chevalier de Bonne Savardin as intermediary in the plot described above. The whole affair miscarried, owing partly to the arrest of Savardin. It was only one of the foolish and violent schemes of the Court which kept Paris in a continual agitation. For the details of this conspiracy see the *Rapport fait au Comité de recherches* July, 1790 (Brit. Mus. R. 165.)

[2] Brissot.

[3] Lafayette.

in the second, it is guilty of prevarication; and in both cases it is unworthy of public confidence. I denounce it as guilty of treason.

When the public safety is in danger, the people's duty is to withdraw the authority from the unworthy hands to which it has been confided; for the public safety is the supreme law before which all others must be silent.

Therefore I invite all good citizens at once to meet, to go to the national Inquiry Committee, request to see the orders given to the Municipal Committee, then to go to the Town Hall, seize the records of the Committee, demand the minutes of the perquisitions made pursuant to these orders, and, upon refusal to make certain of the persons of all the members of the committee and keep them under strict guard.

Recent News

[*Account of the massing of Austrian troops on the French Frontiers, of the* 13,000 *Royalists at Chambéry, allowing of Austrian troops to march through French territory to Belgium,*[1] *etc.*]

Address to All Citizens

CITIZENS, our enemies are at our gates, the ministry has opened to them our barriers under pretext of according them free passage through our territory; at this moment perhaps they advance with long strides against us; the king is going to retire to Compiègne,[2] where there are lodgings being prepared for him; from Compiègne to Toul or Metz he can make his way incognito; what will prevent him going to join the Austrian army and the regular troops that have remained devoted to him? Soon from all sides will run to him army officers, malcontents and especially the faithful, de Besenval d'Autichamp, Lambesc and de Broglio. Already one minister, whom I demanded you should make sure of, the infamous Guignard,[3] denounced as the head of the conspiracy, has now fled; his colleagues will not be slow to follow his example and go to some Lorraine town to form the council of State, the executive power. The King, our good King, who disdained to swear to be faithful to you on the altar of the country, has kept the most complete silence about all these horrors. The national Inquiry Committee only opened its mouth the moment the mine was exploded; the municipal Inquiry Committee, sold to the Court, refused to seize the thread of these infernal plots; the chief of your municipality and the chief of your militia [both] informed of what was happening, instead of fulfilling their duty and making sure of the ministers, have arranged for the traitor Bonne de Savardin to escape from prison, so as to remove from you the proofs of the perfidy of the Ministry, and perhaps of themselves.

To prevent your reflecting on the dangers that menace you, they cease not [have not ceased] to stun you with festivals, and keep [have kept] you

[1] Belgium was then Austrian. This was probably merely a courtesy to the Austrians to allow of their manœuvring more easily. Nevertheless, since there was a considerable feudal revolt in Brabant, which these troops would be used to suppress, the Assembly decided to withdraw the permission on the 27th, and despatch 30,000 National Guards to see that the frontier was respected.

[2] Mirabeau had actually made this proposal.

[3] The Comte de Saint-Priest.

drunk to prevent your seeing the misfortunes ready to burst upon you. Would you have believed it, your general, who has left undone no means of seduction, has just formed against the desire of all the districts, a park of artillery destined to shoot you down; the staff of your guards is composed only of your enemies, hirelings of the prince; nearly all your battalion-commanders have been won over; and, worst horror of all, the Paris Militia is now almost entirely composed of vain or blind men who have forgotten their country before their General's cajolery.

Citizens of all ages and ranks, the measures taken by the National Assembly could not prevent your perishing: you are lost for ever unless you rush to arms, unless you find again that valour which on the 14th July and 5th October[1], twice saved France. Fly to Saint Cloud, if there is yet time, bring back the King and the Dauphin within your walls, keep them under close guard, and let them answer to you for the course of events; imprison the Austrian woman [*the Queen*] and her brother-in-law to stop their plotting; seize all the ministers and their servants and put them in chains [execute them], make certain of the head of the municipality and the Mayor's lieutenants; keep the General in view; arrest the staff, capture the park of artillery in the Rue Verte, seize all the magazines and powder mills; let the guns be divided among all the districts, let all the districts re-establish themselves and remain for ever permanent, let the fatal decrees be revoked. Run, run, if there is yet time [*omitted*], or soon many enemy legions will burst on you; soon you will see the privileged orders reviving [and] despotism, terrible despotism will reappear more formidable than ever.

Five or six hundred executions would have assured you repose, liberty and happiness; a false humanity has restrained your hands and stopped your blows; this will cost the lives of millions of your brothers; if your enemies triumph a minute blood will flow in seas; they will cut your throats without pity, they will rip up your wives, and, to extinguish for ever the love of liberty among you, their bloody hands will tear out your children's hearts from their bodies.

MARAT, *Friend of the People*

1790 August: The Nancy Massacres.

8 COMTE DE MIRABEAU: SPEECH ON ÉMIGRÉS

H. G. Riqueti, Comte de Mirabeau, speaking on the Proposal of Le Chapelier to establish a Commission of Three without whose leave no one should leave France, on February 28, 1791

(*After the reading of the Bill*)—

I WAS in process of speaking, I claimed the right to speak during the reading of the bill, I insist on it. (*He is permitted to occupy the tribune.*) Legislating and proposing laws cannot be harmonised with excess of zeal of any kind; not indignation but reflection should make laws, most

[1] 1789

certainly carry them out. The National Assembly has not done to the Committee on the Constitution the same honour that the Athenians did to Aristides when they made him judge of the morality of his own project.[1]

But the murmurs that arose during the reading of the Committee's proposals showed that you were as good judges of its morality as Aristides, and were wise to keep the jurisdiction in your own hands I shall not insult the Committee by saying that its bill deserves a place among the laws of Draco, but could never be included among the decrees of the National Assembly of France; what I shall attempt to show is that the barbarity of the law proposed is the most complete proof of the impracticability of a law concerning the émigrés.[2] (*Applause from the Right and part of the Left: the rest of the Assembly murmurs.*)

I demand to be heard. If there are circumstances when police measures are absolutely necessary even against the principles and laws we have accepted, it is a necessary offence, and as society may, for its preservation, do whatever it wishes, such a police measure can be taken by the executive power, and when it has received the sanction of the controller of the law, of the supreme chief of the social police, it is as binding as any other; but the difference between a police measure and a law is immense. The law on émigrés is, I repeat, outside your powers since it is impracticable, and it is not of your wisdom to pass a law which you cannot carry out even by reducing all parts of the empire to anarchy. It has been proved at all times that even with the most concentrated and despotic executive power, in the hands of Busiris, no such law has been ever carried out, because it cannot be. (*Applause and murmurs. The President:* You are wandering from the subject.) A police measure is no doubt in your power; it remains to discover if it is your duty to promulgate it, that is, if it is useful, if you desire to hold citizens in the empire otherwise than by the beneficence of the laws and the good gift of liberty; for to say that you can do this is not to say that you should. But I shall not attempt to prove this, I should be wandering from the point; the question is whether the Committee's proposal be discussed, and I say, No. I declare that I should regard myself free from any oath of fidelity to any person who committed the infamy of setting up a dictatorial committee. (*Applause.*) The popularity which I desired and which I have the honour (*violent murmurs on the extreme Left: some applause in the hall and galleries*), the popularity which I have the honour to enjoy like anyone else is but a fragile reed. I wish its roots to grow on earth, on the immovable foundation of liberty and reason. (*Applause.*) If you pass a law against the émigrés, I swear I will never obey it. (*Murmurs on the extreme Left redouble. Some applause heard.*)

(*Mirabeau then moved the "order of the day," but lost.*)

[1] The Committee, for whom Le Chapelier spoke, admitted that this Bill was a violation of Article I. of the Constitution. The proposal was eventually rejected.

[2] " Sur l'emigration."

9 LAW OF JUNE 14, 1791, ON ASSOCIATIONS[1]

FIRST ARTICLE

THE destruction of all kinds of corporations of Citizens of the same status and profession being one of the fundamental bases of the French Constitution, it is forbidden to re-establish them in fact, under whatever pretext or form.

ART. II

Citizens of the same status or professions—*entrepreneurs*, shopkeepers, workers and journeymen of any art, cannot, when they have met together, elect a President, or secretaries, or representatives, keep minutes, make decisions or deliberations or formulate rules in their alleged common interest.

[3 *No authority may consider the petitions of such a body.*]

[4 *Instigation to form such a body punishable by a fine of* 500 *livres and loss for a year of civic rights.*]

[5 *No authority may employ the members of such a body.*]

ART. VI

If such deliberations or conventions when published by means of posters or circular letters, contain any threats against the *entrepreneurs*, artisans, workmen or journeymen who come from elsewhere to work in the locality, or against any who are contented with lower pay, the authors, instigators and signatories of the act or writing shall be punished by a fine of 1,000 *livres* each and three months' imprisonment.

[7 *Assaults on free workers and employers to be punished in the usual way as breaches of the peace.*]

ART. VIII

All large meetings[2] of artisans, workers and journeymen, instigated by them against the freedom of labouring * * * are to be considered seditious and punished as such.[3]

[1] No attempt was made to repeal this law later, even by the Mountain.

[2] " Attroupements."

[3] This law is a pendant to the law of February 17, 1791, which is of equal if not greater importance. It is full of obsolete technical terms and has been judged too dull to translate in full, nor are its exact terms a matter of much interest. It suppressed all corporations and guilds, with compensation that was largely illusory, and declared that " From the first of April next every person is free to engage in any transaction and to exercise whatever profession, art, or occupation he desires." The full text is to be found in Levasseur, *Histoire des classes ouvrières en France* 1789–1870, I., p. 291, or in the *Reimpression de L'Ancien Moniteur*, February 17, 1791.

Both laws were based upon Article III. of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and ultimately upon Rousseau's theory of the relation of the State to lesser associations. In his *Political Economy*, he says:

" Every political society is composed of other smaller societies of different kinds, each of which has its interests and rules of conduct; but those societies which everyone perceives, because they have an external and authorised form, are not the only ones that actually exist in the State; all individuals who are united by a common interest composed as many others, either temporary or permanent, whose influence is none the less real because it is less apparent, and the proper observance of whose various relations is the true knowledge of public morals and manners. The influence of all these tacit or formal associations, causes, by the influence of their will, as many different modifications of the public will. The will of these particular societies has always two relations: for the members of the association it is a general will; for the great society it is a particular will, and it is often right with regard to the first object and wrong as to the second. An individual may be a devout priest, a brave soldier or a zealous senator, and yet a bad citizen. A particular resolution may be advantageous to the smaller community but pernicious to the greater. It is true that, particular societies being always subordinate to the general society in preference to others, the duty of a citizen takes precedence of that of a senator, and a man's duty of that of a citizen, but, unhappily, personal interest is always found in inverse ratio to duty and increases in proportion as the associa-

1791 June 20: King attempts to escape from France and is arrested at Varennes.

10 DECLARATION OF THE CORDELIERS CLUB, JUNE 22, 1791[1]

THE free Frenchmen composing the Society of the Friends of the Rights of Man and the Citizen, club of the Cordeliers, announce to all their fellow-citizens that the Society contains as many tyrannicides as members, who have all individually sworn to kill tyrants who dare to attack our frontiers or make any attempt in whatever way against our liberty and our constitution, and have signed.

1791 July: Foundation of the Feuillants Club.

11 MANIFESTO SIGNED IN THE CHAMPS DE MARS, JULY 16, 1791

THE undersigned Frenchmen, members of the sovereign people, considering that in questions concerning the safety of the people it is their right to express their will to enlighten and guide their deputies,

that no question has ever arisen more important than the King's desertion,

that the decree of the 15th July contains no decision concerning Louis XVI,

that in obeying this decree it is necessary to decide promptly the future of this individual, that his conduct must form the basis of this decision,

that Louis XVI, having accepted Royal functions, and sworn to defend the Constitution, has deserted the post entrusted to him; has protested against that very Constitution in a declaration written and signed in his own hand; has attempted by his flight and his orders to paralyse the executive power, and to upset the Constitution in complicity with men who are to-day awaiting trial for such an attempt,

that his perjury, his desertion, his protest, not to speak of all the other criminal acts which have proceeded accompanied and followed them, involve a formal abdication of the constitutional Crown entrusted to him,

that the National Assembly has so judged in assuming the executive power, suspending the Royal authority and holding him in a state of arrest,

tion grows narrower and the engagement less sacred; which irrefragably proves that the general will is always the most just also, and that the voice of the people is, in fact, the voice of God."

See Rousseau: *The Social Contract*, etc., translated with an introduction by G. D. H. Cole (Everyman edition), p. 253.

[1] The declaration opens with some poor French Alexandrines, which have been omitted.

that fresh promises from Louis XVI to observe the Constitution cannot offer the Nation a sufficient guarantee against a fresh perjury and a new conspiracy,

considering finally that it would be as contrary to the majesty of the outraged Nation as it would be contrary to its interest to confide the reins of empire to a perjurer, a traitor and a fugitive,

formally and specifically demand that the Assembly receive the abdication made on the 21st of June by Louis XVI of the crown which had been delegated to him, and provide for his successor in the constitutional manner,

declare that the undersigned will never recognise Louis XVI as their King unless the majority of the Nation express a desire contrary to the present petition.

1791 July 17: Massacre in the Champs de Mars of the signatories of the petition, by Lafayette.

12 DECLARATION OF PILLNITZ, SIGNED IN COMMON BY THE EMPEROR[1] AND THE KING OF PRUSSIA, AUGUST 27, 1791

HIS MAJESTY the Emperor and His Majesty the King of Prussia, having heard the desires and representations of Monsieur[2] and the Count of Artois[3], declare conjointly that they regard the present situation of the King of France as a matter concerning all the sovereigns of Europe. They hope that this interest cannot fail to be recognised by the Powers whose assistance is desired, and that therefore they will not refuse to employ in conjunction with their said Majesties, the most efficacious means in their power to place the King of France in a position to establish in perfect freedom the foundations of a monarchical government equally suited to the rights of Sovereigns and the prosperity of the French Nation. Then, and in this case,[4] their said Majesties the Emperor and the King of Prussia have resolved to act in harmony and promptly with the forces necessary to secure the common end they have set themselves. Meanwhile, they will give their troops such orders as will put them in readiness to take action.

(Signed) LEOPOLD and
FREDERICK-WILLIAM

Pillnitz,
27th August, 1791.

[1] Of Austria. By title, Holy Roman Emperor, having a largely nominal authority over all Germany.

[2] Louis XVI's eldest brother, Louis Stanislas Xavier.

[3] Louis XVI's next brother, Charles Philippe, later King Charles X of France. These two Princes sent, apropos of this Pillnitz declaration, a letter to the King from Coblentz which falsely asserted that the Powers were certain to co-operate as desired. This was regarded, as it was meant to be, as a threat of instant invasion. As a matter of fact, the Powers would not move, nor was Leopold really anxious to do anything. Hence this proclamation was largely " bluff " on the part of the émigrés, but its effect on Paris was electric.

[4] *i.e.*, if the Powers in question decide to assist.

1791 September 29: Constituent Assembly dissolves.
1791 October 1: Legislative Assembly meets.
1792 April 21: War with Austria.

13 EXTRACT FROM THE ADDRESS OF THE FORTY-SEVEN SECTIONS OF PARIS TO THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY, AUGUST 3

* * * Outside, armed enemies threaten our land. Two despots issue against the French nation a manifesto as insolent as it is absurd. Parricidal Frenchmen, led by the brothers, relatives and allies of the King, prepare to murder their country.

And it is in the name of Louis XVI that the national sovereignty is impudently outraged; it is to avenge Louis XVI that the execrable House of Austria adds a fresh chapter to the history of its cruelties. * * *

It is the head of the executive power who is the first link in the counter-revolutionary chain. He appears to have taken part in the plots of Pillnitz which he divulged so late. Henceforward his name struggles against the nation's. He has separated his interests from the nation. We, too, separate them. For as long as we have a king like this, liberty cannot take firm root, and we wish to remain free. A remnant of indulgence makes us wish we could demand the suspension of Louis XVI while the country is in danger, but the Constitution does not allow this, and *we demand his dethronement.*

Once this great measure has been taken, since it is very doubtful whether the nation can have any confidence in the existing dynasty we demand that ministers, collectively responsible, named by the Assembly but from outside its numbers, as is constitutional, chosen by open voting as befits free men, shall provisionally exercise executive power, until the people's will, our ruler and yours, is legally expressed in a *National Convention*, as soon as the safety of the State will permit.

Yet let our enemies, whoever they be, gather on our frontiers, let cowards and perjurers abandon the soil of liberty, let 300,000 slaves advance; before them they will find ten million free men ready to die or conquer, fighting for equality, for their country's soil, for their women, children and old men; let each of us be a soldier in his turn, and if fate brings us the honour of dying for our country, let each before his last breath glorify his memory by the death of a slave or a tyrant.

1792 August 10: Capture of the Tuileries by the people. Louis imprisoned.

14 (GIRONDIN) DECREE ON THE DIVISION OF COMMUNAL LANDS, AUGUST 14, 1792[1]

ON the Motion of Nicolas François de Neufchâteau.

Firstly: This year, immediately after the harvest, all the communal lands and usages other than woods shall be divided among the citizens of each commune.

[1] Cf. 19.

Secondly: These citizens shall enjoy complete ownership of their respec-
'e portions.
Thirdly: The communal property known as "nobody's" and "vacant,"
all be equally divided between the inhabitants.
Fourthly: To fix the method of division the Committee of Agriculture
all, in three days, propose a plan to be decreed.

92 September 2 and 3: The September Massacres.
92 September 20: Convention first meets.
92 September 20: The Battle of Valmy.

5 GEORGES-JACQUES DANTON: SPEECH ON PROPERTY TO THE NATIONAL CONVENTION, SEPTEMBER 21, 1792

* * * No constitution can exist but that which is textually and formally
:epted by the primary assemblies. This is what you should declare
the people. Then the empty bogey of dictatorship, the extra-
gant notion of a triumvirate, all these absurdities invented to frighten
: people will disappear, since nothing will be constitutional but what the
ple has accepted. After this declaration you should make another that is
less important for liberty and public peace. Up till now we have roused
: people because we had to sound the alarm against tyrants. To-day the
's must be as terrible to those who attack them, as the people was in
shing tyranny; they must punish all the guilty so that the people's will be
: unfulfilled. (*Applause.*) It seems to have been thought—excellent
zens have held, that friends of liberty may damage the social order in
ggerating their principles; well, let us now abjure all exaggeration; let
declare that all territorial, individual and industrial property shall be for
r maintained. (*Unanimous applause.*) Let us next remember that we have
reconsider and recreate everything, that even the Declaration of Rights is
unspotted, and must be revised by a truly free people.[1]

92 November 6: Battle of Jemmappes.
93 January 21: Execution of Louis XVI.
93 March 10: Constitution of the Revolutionary Tribunal.
93 March 18: Defeat of Dumouriez at Neerwinden.
93 March 25: Dumouriez goes over to the Austrians.

) ADDRESS OF THE JACOBINS CLUB, APRIL 13

THE SOCIETY OF THE FRIENDS OF LIBERTY AND EQUALITY, OF PARIS TO THEIR BROTHERS OF THE DEPARTMENTS.

NTED BY ORDER OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION, AND SENT TO THE DEPARTMENTS AND THE ARMIES

[1] This obviously does not represent the most enlightened Jacobin conception of property, for which
ther No. 17. The Girondins were mostly content dully to repeat *Property is sacred.* But see Lichten-
r: *Le Socialisme et la Révolution Française, passim.*

April 13th, 1793,[1] *Year 2 of the French Republic.*

FRIENDS, we are betrayed! To arms! To arms! Now is the terrible hour when the country's defenders must conquer or find their graves in the bleeding ruins of the republic. Frenchmen, never was your liberty in greater peril! Our enemies have at last set the seal on their black perfidy, and, to complete it, their accomplice Dumouriez is marching on Paris. The open treason of the generals in coalition with him does not allow us to doubt that this plan of rebellion and this insolent audacity are directed by the criminal faction which has maintained and deified him as it did La Fayette, and which has deceived us up to the critical moment on the conduct, intrigues, defeats and machinations of this traitor, this impious man who has just arrested the four commissaries of the Convention and desires to dissolve it; three members of our society, commissaries of the executive council had preceded them: these were, they who risked their lives to tear the veil aside and thus decided the infamous Dumouriez.

But, brothers, not all your dangers are there! You must be convinced of a far more saddening truth: your worst enemies are in your midst and guide your operations. Oh, Revenge! They conduct your defence!

Yes, brothers and friends, it is in the Senate that parricidal hands tear your vitals! Yes, the counter-revolution is in the Government, in the National Convention; there, at the centre of your safety and your hopes, do the criminal delegates hold the threads of the web they have woven with the lords of despots who come to slay us! There is a sacrilegious cabal directed by the English court and others. . . .

But, already indignation inflames your brave civic hearts. Come, republicans, let us arm! Without being weakened by useless terrors about our calamities, let our wisdom settle on the means of safety which remain, which are:

Rise! Yes, rise all! Arrest all the enemies of our revolution and all suspects. Exterminate pitilessly all conspirators unless we wish to be exterminated ourselves. To give back its force and energy to the National Convention, which alone can save us, let the patriotic deputies on mission to the 83 departments be recalled to their posts; let them return as soon as possible; and, following the example of the generous Marseillais, let new apostles of liberty be chosen by you and from amongst you; let them be sent into the towns and country both to hasten recruiting and to warm civic spirit and point out traitors.

Let the departments, districts, municipalities and all patriotic societies unite and agree to appeal to the Convention; to send a rain of petitions formally demanding the instant recall of all the unfaithful members who have failed in their duty in not desiring the tyrant's death, and particularly against those who have led astray so many of their colleagues. *Such delegates are traitors, royalists, or idiots.* The republic condemns the friends of kings; they are the men who cut her up, ruin her and have sworn to annihilate her.

[1] Really delivered a few days earlier.

Yes, citizens, those are they who have formed this criminal and disastrous faction. With them, your liberty is gone; by their prompt expulsion the country can be saved.

Let all equally unite to demand that the thunder of decrees of accusation be loosed against treacherous generals, prevaricating ministers, functionaries, and on all the faithless agents of the government. This is our best means of defence: let us defeat the traitors and tyrants.

Here is the heart of their conspiracy: it is in Paris that our perfidious enemies wish to complete their crime. Paris, the cradle and bulwark of liberty, is, doubt it not, the place where they have sworn to bury the holy cause of humanity under the corpses of patriots.

On Paris Dumouriez aims his revenge, rallying to his party the Royalists, the Feuillants, the Moderates and all the cowardly enemies of our liberty. It is thus at Paris we must all defend it; and keep this well in your minds: Paris without you cannot save the Republic. Already the brave Marseillais are up and it is to anticipate their arrival that the scoundrelly cabal presses on the completion of traitor Dumouriez' crimes.

Frenchmen, our country is in the greatest danger! Dumouriez declares war on the people, and, suddenly become the vanguard of France's savage enemies, a part of his army seduced by this great criminal marches on Paris to re-establish royalty and dissolve the National Convention.

To arms, Republicans! Rush to Paris, that is France's rendezvous. Paris must be the nation's headquarters. To arms! To arms! . . No deliberation, no delay, or liberty is lost! All means to hasten your march must be used. If we are attacked before you come, we know how to fight and die, and we will surrender Paris only in ashes.

(*Signed*) MARAT, *Acting President*
DUBUISSON, *Vice-President*
JAY, DUQUESNOI, *Deputies*
COINDRE, DEPERRET, CHAMPERTOIS, PRIEUR, *Secretaries*

[An additional leaf contains signatures of distinguished adherents to the Address, including: Anacharsis Cloots, Panis, Robespierre, Jun., Fabre d'Eglantine, P. J. Audouin, Vadier, Camille Desmoulins, Dubois Crancé, Bentabole, Laignelot and Drouet. At the bottom—"A Paris, de l'imprimerie Nationale" (Paris, at the National Press). This appeal was the direct preliminary to the "purge" of May 31. It is the more interesting to note that the National Convention ordered it to be printed.]

17 SPEECH OF MAXIMILIEN ROBESPIERRE ON PROPERTY (IN THE NATIONAL CONVENTION, APRIL 24)

ORDERED TO BE PRINTED BY THE NATIONAL CONVENTION

I SHALL propose first certain articles necessary to complete your theory of property. Let that word alarm nobody. You souls of mud who value nothing but gold, I am not going to touch your treasure,

however foul its source. You should know that this agrarian law, of which you have spoken so much, is only a bogey raised by knaves to frighten fools.

Certainly, a revolution is not necessary to convince us that the extremes of wealth and poverty are the source of many evils and many crimes, yet we are nevertheless convinced that equality of wealth is a chimera. For myself I think it even less necessary for private good than for public happiness. It is much more important to make poverty honourable than to proscribe riches. The cottage of Fabricius has no reason to envy the palace of Crassus. For my own part I would far prefer to be a son of Aristides brought up in the Prytaneum at the expense of the Republic, than the heir-presumptive of Xerxes, born in the mire of courts to occupy a throne decorated by the degradation of peoples, shining by the common poverty.

Let us therefore honestly declare the principles of the rights of property: it is all the more necessary since human prejudice and vice have attempted to cover them all in the deepest darkness.

Ask that seller of human flesh what is property; he will point to that huge grave that he calls a ship, where he has packed and chained men who seem to live, and reply: "There is my property; head by head I have bought it." Inquire of this gentleman who has estates and vassals, or who thinks the world awry since he has lost them; he will give you ideas on property which are much the same.

Inquire of the august members of the dynasty of Capet; they will tell you that the most sacred right of property is without doubt the hereditary right which they have enjoyed from all antiquity, of oppressing, degrading, and grinding down legally and royally the 25 million men who inhabit the land of France, at their good pleasure.

In the eyes of all these people, property has no relation to any moral principle. Why does your Declaration of Rights seem to contain the same error? In defining liberty, the first of human goods, the holiest of the rights man naturally has, you said truly that it was limited by the rights of one's neighbour; why did you not apply that principle to property, which is a social institution: as though the eternal laws of nature were less inviolable than human agreements? You have multiplied articles to ensure the greatest freedom in the exercise of property, and have not said a single word to define its legitimate character; so that your Declaration seems made not for men, but for the wealthy, the monopolists, stockjobbers and tyrants. I propose to you to reform these faults in sanctioning the following truths:—

FIRST ARTICLE

Property is the right that each citizen has to enjoy and dispose of the portion of wealth guaranteed him by the law.

II The right of property, like all other rights, is limited by the obligation to respect the rights of others.

III It cannot prejudice the safety, liberty, existence or property of our fellows.

IV Any possession or commerce which violates this condition is illicit and immoral.

You also establish the incontestable principle that taxation can only be imposed by the will of the people or its representatives; but you omit an arrangement demanded by the interests of humanity: you have forgotten to sanction the principle of the graduated tax. But, in public affairs, is there any principle more clearly natural and just than that which imposes on citizens the obligation to contribute to public expenses progressively, according to the size of their fortunes, that is, according to the advantages they draw from society?

I propose to embody it in an article phrased thus: "Citizens whose income does not exceed what is necessary for their subsistence must be excused from contributing to the public expenses; others must support such expenses progressively, according to the size of their fortunes."[1]

Again, the Committee has entirely omitted to mention the bonds of fraternity which unite all men and all nations, and their rights to mutual assistance; it seems to have known nothing of the bases of the eternal alliance of peoples against tyrants; one would have thought your declaration made by a flock of human beings herded in a corner of the world, and not for the immense family to whom nature has given the earth for domain and home. I propose to you to fill up this great lacuna by the following articles, which can but raise you in the esteem of peoples: though they may have the disadvantage of making you break for ever with their kings. This disadvantage I admit does not alarm me; it will alarm none but those who desire reconciliation with them.

Here are my four articles:

FIRST ARTICLE

The men of all countries are brothers, and the different peoples should assist one another as much as possible like citizens of the same state.

II He who oppresses one nation declares himself the enemy of all.

III Those who make war on a people to stop the progress of liberty and destroy the rights of man should be attacked by all, not as ordinary enemies, but as assassins and rebellious brigands.

IV Kings, aristocrats, tyrants whoever they are, are slaves in revolt against the lord of the earth, the human race, and against the legislator of the universe, Nature.

De l'imprimerie nationale—*i.e.*, at the National Press.)

[1] In the final form approved by Robespierre (*Lettres à ses Commettans*, last number) he himself omitted this section from his amended Declaration of the Rights of Man.

18 MARGUERITE ELIE GUADET (GIRONDIN) TO THE NATIONAL CONVENTION ON MAY 18, 1793. SPEECH MOVING THE SUPPRESSION OF THE COMMUNE[1]

CITIZENS, when virtuous men content themselves with sighing over their country's misfortunes, then conspirators move for their destruction; like Cæsar, they say—"Let them talk while we act." Well then——Act also! What! The policing of the interior is done by mad women, no doubt paid by Pitt's agents, and you are silent! (*Murmurs from the gallery.*) If you had listened to me I could have told you of a plot to dissolve, to slay the National Convention (*same murmurs*). I should have informed you that the day before yesterday, in a meeting of members of so-called revolutionary committees, it was resolved to arrest all suspects, that is all who have not the honourable hallmark of the 2nd September[2] and the 10th March,[3] and following these arrests, to hand you over to that deluded multitude which has been taught to love blood! (*Disturbance in all the hall.*) I would have told you that in the presence of the General Council of the Paris Commune, the commander of the armed force of the section of the Sans-culottes, Henriot said: "Consider, citizens, that in leaving for the Vendée you leave here Rolandins, Brissotins, Girondins, marshtoads who . . . . (*Interruptions and loud applause.*) Finally I should have told you that the tumult you hear has for only object to precipitate the movement. . . . .(*More disturbance. Guadet continues through the noise.*) For how long, citizens . . . . for how long will you sleep, citizens . . . . for how long will you sleep, citizens, on the edge of a precipice? For how long will you leave the fate of liberty to chance? If up till now fortune has done everything for you, no doubt you should be pleased with her, but if you do nothing for liberty, I ask you, will you be pleased with yourselves? Therefore I demand of you vigorous measures to defeat the plots surrounding you.

Up till now the conspirators of the 10th of March have remained unpunished: we must have courage enough to probe the wound to its depths. The evil lies in anarchy, in this kind of insurrection of authorities against the Convention; it is in the Paris authorities who have exceeded their legal limits and whom we must . . . . (*violent movement of disapproval on the Left*). Yes, I repeat, the evil lies in the existence of the Paris authorities, greedy alike of money and domination! (*Same movement.*)

Citizens, it is yet time, take strong measures and you can save the Republic and your own tarnished glory! I propose these three measures to the Convention:—

1. The authorities of Paris are suspended. The municipality shall pro-

[1] This speech, moving the suppression of the Commune, the real organ of revolution, and the removal of the Assembly from the revolutionary centre, Paris, marks the greatest effort of the Girondins to crush the advanced party. It is the counterpart of the previous manifesto (No. 16). The influence of the Committee of Public Safety led to the substitution of the Commission of Twelve.

[2] The September Massacres.

[3] The institution of the revolutionary tribunal in reply to popular demand.

visionally and within 24 hours be replaced by the presidents of the sections. (*Applause from the majority: murmurs from the Left: threats from the galleries.*)

2. The substitutes for the members of the Convention shall with the least possible delay meet at Bourges: but they cannot however commence deliberations save after an express decree authorising them, or upon the certain news of the Convention's dissolution.

3. This measure shall be communicated by special couriers to the departments.

When these measures have been adopted we shall work with energy and tranquil minds, knowing that we have placed in safety the seat of liberty.

1793 May 31—June 2: Girondin leaders expelled from the Convention.

19 JACOBIN DECREE ON COMMUNAL LANDS, ETC. SUMMARY OF THE DECREE OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION (COMPARE WITH No. 14)

"MONDAY, the 10th of June, 1793, second year of the French Republic."

I. [Definition of a commune and communal lands. Certain forms of land which are not to be divided: mines, roads, woods, etc.]

II. "The division of lands shall be per head of every domiciled inhabitant of any age or sex, present or absent." [Definition of "domiciled."] The Lord of the Manor has no right to take part in this division if he has ever used the right of "triage," hereby abolished.[1] No lands acquired by this division may be sold for ten years.

III. "A week after the publication of the present law, the municipality in whose district is situated the common land, or in its default, the Administration of the District, shall call together all the citizens who have a right to share in the division, in the prescribed form for communal assemblies. * * * Every individual of either sex having a right to a share over 21 years of age may vote. * * * If a third of those present vote for division, division shall take place." The assembly can also decide to retain some and not all as communal property. Three experts, not members of the commune are to be chosen to effect the division and note the roads etc. which will have to be preserved. [Provisions for a written record of this division.]

IV. All waste and park land is to be considered communal.[2] No feudal rights or claims by possession can justify the Lord of the Manor in holding any land, only a written record of sale. All feudal property in land is suppressed. The property of all religious orders and the Church is also communal.

V. The Directory of the department shall settle quarrels between Com-

[1] "Triage." The right of taking one-third of the produce of communal land.

[2] All communal lands known as "terres vaines et vagues, *gastes*, *garrigues*, landes, pacages, patis, ajoncs, bruyères, bois communs, hermes, vacans, palus, marais, marécages, montagnes" and by any other name whatever.

munes. Litigation between Communes and private owners shall be settled by arbitration. [Detailed machinery of this.]

1793 July 14: Marat assassinated by Ch. Corday.

20 J. R. HEBERT: PÈRE DUCHESNE ON MARAT'S DEATH, No. 260[1] [JULY 15?]

THE GREAT SORROW

of

PÈRE DUCHESNE

at the death of Marat assassinated with a knife by a Calvados garce *directed by Bishop Fauchet. His* good advice *to the brave Sans-culottes to be always on their guard since there are in Paris thousands of the shaved [priests] of the Vendée with their paws greased to cut the throats of all good citizens.*

MARAT lives no more, *foutre*. People, groan, weep for your best friend. He dies a martyr for liberty. It was Calvados that vomited the monster beneath whose blows he has just died. A young girl, or rather a fury armed by the priests, and—they say—confessed by the hypocrite Fauchet, leaves Caen to commit this horrible attack. She arrives in Paris, and having bought a large knife at the Palace which I shall still call Royal[2] since it is the rendezvous of all the earth's scoundrels, she knocks three days consecutively at Marat's door and asks to see him.

The poor *bougre*, tired out with work, could not see or speak to any one. Nevertheless a woman's plaintive voice reaches his ear: he believes she is an unfortunate come to implore for his help. Let her in, he says: the scoundrel appears with a sorrowful air and approaches his bath where he then was: "Citizen," she says, "you are the father of the unhappy, the defender of the oppressed; I turn to you with confidence to obtain justice. My father, an unfortunate old man and a good patriot, groans in chains." An old man, a father of a family, a good citizen is in chains, replies Marat, reassure yourself, young citizen, I will avenge him. To bring me the occasion of helping in so touching a case is to oblige me. Where is your home?.... Caen.... Caen! ....Yes, citizen Marat, I come from there....Well then, is your department always to be in the wrong? Are these Normans whom they threaten us with really marching on Paris? You see how tranquil Paris is. You can yourself judge the scoundrels who seek to kindle civil war. They told you that here everything was blood and fire and the Convention was no more, yet order and peace reign and the Convention was never so great or more respected. From everywhere it receives blessings for having made a constitution entirely republican and popular ....

[1] Rubbed title piece, apparently a man armed and smoking a pipe, weapons and a kneeling priest behind. Motto: MEMENTO MORI, and, lower, " I am the true Père Duchesne, *foutre*." Hebert always wrote in this style, and, as it is impossible to omit him, I have chosen mild examples.

[2] The Palais-Royal.

Friend of the people, in my turn let me ask you some questions. What do you yourself think of the deputies who have retired to our department; what will happen to them? . . . . What will happen to them? France shall know of their criminal plots. Soon they will have no refuge and in a little while the guillotine . . . .

At that word the ape takes from her bosom the knife she had hidden there and buries it in Marat's throat. *Help! To me!* he cried. These words were his last. Two women ran up: they see the blood spurting from the wound, they try to stop the *garce* who has committed the crime, but she fights and gets to the door. Neighbours run up at the noise and seize the scoundrel. The guard runs up, quickly all the Marseille section with its arms surrounds the house.

The fatal news is soon spread about all Paris. The aristocrats are in the seventh heaven of delight; good citizens in despair come to weep on the bed of their true friend. I was not the last to go there, *foutre*, and I was there when the scoundrel was examined. She has the gentleness of a cat who sheathes her claws to scratch better: she seemed no more troubled than she would have been if she had done a good deed. The Commissary asks her name; she answers that it is Charlotte Cordet (*sic*) daughter of a sometime gentleman; she tranquilly tells her beads and admits that she had come to Paris only to kill Marat whom she regarded as the country's enemy and was glad to have killed. "I expect death," she said, "but I have chosen my part long ago; alone I formed this project; so fine did it seem to me that I told no one, so as to have alone the glory."

If I had believed this I would have made this tigress into catsmeat. What has Marat done to you? I ask her. You lied when you defended yourself by saying that you regarded him as the country's enemy. You yourself recognised him for a good citizen and a fine *bougre*, since, in order to see him, you sought to excite his pity.

She does not answer this question. She is searched, her pockets are well lined with heavy *écus* and forged assignats. She always replies with assurance and goes to prison as tranquilly as to a ball. This blow is not the last our enemies will deal the patriots. The same *jean foutres* who have so often stirred up looting, have now no other method of turning Paris upside down except by murdering good citizens in detail. Robespierre, Pache, Chaumet (*sic*), and I are on their lists. Every day I receive loveletters in which I am told I am to be massacred, hung, blown up, burnt on a slow fire: others inform me that they will eat my heart in paper, others that they will drink my blood, others that they will split my skull and drink from it to the King's health.

Je me fous of these threats, they will not prevent me from telling the truth; while I have a breath left I will defend the rights of the people and my Republic, *foutre*. My life is not mine but my country's, and I should be only too happy if my death could be of use to the Sans-Culottes, who in spite of assassins and poisoners will always be the stronger. Anyhow, if I die, it will be at the last possible moment and I'll have an answer to the scoundrels who

attack me. I invite good citizens to be on their guard and protect the true friends of the people. Unfortunately, they are few. Remember, Sans-culottes, that if Marat and Robespierre had never existed you would have no more liberty than the palm of my hand.

I should hope, *foutre*, that our brothers in the departments, who have been Buzotised,[1] will retrieve their error. They will see which side the knives are on. Already two deputies have been murdered by the Brissotins[2] and the Brissotins still live. Not one has received a single slap.[3] Yet I expect that Priest Fauchet and his comrade Duperret, accomplices of the Calvados garce, who are in jail[4] with her will pay the penalty of their misdeeds. Let a tomb be raised to the Friend of the People: let his precious remains there be shown to the citizens; in the same place and fronting the tomb let a gallows be erected for Brissot, Duperret,[5] Fauchet and the Norman woman. On one side the people's tears will show its gratitude, on the other, curses will precede its vengeance: but the guillotine is not enough to punish the traitors with, a new punishment is needed, more terrible and degrading, equal to the crime itself if that is possible, *foutre*.

HEBERT

Printed at the Cour des Miracles rue Neuve de l'Egalité, some time Bourbon Villeneuve.

21 SUMMARY OF DECREE OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION ON FEUDAL RIGHTS

"WEDNESDAY, 17th July, 1793, the second year of the French Republic, one and indivisible.

"All former seigneurial rights, fixed or casual feudal rights, even those retained by the decree of August 25th last, are suppressed without compensation.

"Excepted from the operations of the previous clause are those charges and rents which are purely landrents and not feudal."

All legal proceedings concerning such dues to be stopped at once, each party paying its own costs.

The former owners of such dues are to deposit the documents within three months with the municipality which will publicly burn them. Five years in chains is the penalty for failing to produce all documents.

"The Minister of the Interior is instructed to convey this decree directly to the municipalities, which are instructed to execute it themselves without using the Administration as intermediary."

[1] Buzot, a Girondin deputy.
[2] Brissot, leader of the Girondins. The other murdered deputy is Lepeletier.
[3] Probably a reference to the guillotine, which was called "une chiquenaude sur le cou."
[4] "Siflent la linotte."
[5] A Girondin deputy whom Ch. Corday had visited before the murder. Fauchet was another Girondin, now known chiefly for his academic Socialist tendencies.

22 J. R. HEBERT: LE PÈRE DUCHESNE, No. 279, ON BUSINESS MEN, SEPT. 1, 1793[1]

THE GREAT ANGER
of
PÈRE DUCHESNE

On seeing that the fat men continue to eat the little men, and that the rich are open enemies of the republic. His great joy *to see that the* muscadins[2] *of Lyons are going to be brought to their senses.* His good advice *to the Convention to deprive the rich of authority, to protect the poor and no longer to allow all the eggs to be in one basket as under the old regime.*

* * * I agree that it is sad to proceed to extreme measures, cruel to see brothers fighting brothers, but it is still more *foutant* that children should tear their mother's bosom. Long enough the Convention has been gentle to these rebels. Instead of recovering their senses and repenting of their misdeeds, they have committed worse ones: émigrés, refractory priests, even foreigners have found a refuge among these insurgents; the Sans-Culottes have been oppressed by this *foutue canaille;* patriots have been thrown into prisons and loaded with irons, many have been cut down with the sword, the others judged by a bloody tribunal: the friends of liberty have died on the scaffold.

* * * Everywhere and at all times men of commerce have had neither heart nor soul: their cash-box is their God; they only know how to thieve and deceive; they would shave an egg, they would kidnap their own fathers; they traffic in all things, even human flesh; theirs are the ships which sail to the African coasts to capture negroes whom they then treat as worthless cattle. Could it ever be expected that such worthless creatures could become citizens? Above all, a freeman must be humane and disinterested; he must sacrifice everything to his country. Their country, *foutre.* Business men have no such thing. As long as they thought the revolution would be useful to them they supported it and helped the Sans-Culottes to destroy the nobility and the parliaments; but only in order to put themselves in the place of the aristocrats. So that now that there are no more "active citizens," now that the most unfortunate Sans-Culotte enjoys the same rights as the richest miser, all these *jean foutres* have turned their coats and will do anything to destroy the Republic. They have cornered all the food-stuffs and all the necessities so as to resell them for their weight in gold or reduce us to famine: but since they see that the Sans-Culottes will die rather than return to slavery, these cannibals have armed their valets and shop assistants; they have done worse, they have fed, clothed and provisioned the brigands of the Vendée; at this very moment they are opening the ports of Brest and Toulon to the English, and are negotiating with Pitt to hand over to him the Colonies.

* * * * * * * *

Let no one say, *foutre*, that I am a blood-drinker to talk like this; let

[1] Exact date uncertain. Heading, etc., as in No. 20.
[2] Wealthy men, in Lyons the grocers.

nobody imagine that I despise commerce. No man respects more than I the honest man who lives by his industry. Nothing is more respectable than a good business man, a patriotic merchant. Often a single industry enriches a whole town and nourishes thousands of citizens. I have known many business men who were the fathers of their workers. They were satisfied with a moderate profit and were only the housekeepers of the great family they gave work to * * Unfortunately men of such character are rare, but the Republic will produce more, I hope; *eh, foutre*, it will be necessary to hold in dishonour the memory of any one who amasses too large a fortune.

First let us begin by counting riches as nothing, by honouring poverty, and soon there will be less avarice. Let all the national estates be sold in small lots; we must stop having all the eggs in one basket; the great estates must be divided and a dozen farmers rent those which are now cultivated by only one. Soon "corners" will cease and there will be food for everyone. The nation must give help to those who make discoveries and who work hardest; all idlers must be sent to Cayenne, the laws must be respected, all citizens must regard each other as brothers, let old age be respected and aided, that is the constitution, *foutre*. We too will say and repeat, like the Feuillants, *the constitution, the whole constitution and nothing but the constitution*, with this difference, that we believe what we say and will act as we believe * * *

HEBERT.

1793 September 17: Law of the Suspects. The Terror
1793-1794 The Terror.

23 END OF THE LAST NUMBER (7) OF THE "OLD CORDELIER," BY CAMILLE DESMOULINS, MARCH, 1794[1]

* * * No, old monk, I have not changed my principles at all, I still believe what I wrote in one of my earliest numbers; the great remedy for the license of the press is the liberty of the press: there is the spear of Achilles which heals the wounds it inflicts. Political liberty has no better arsenal than the press: and such artillery has this advantage. The guns of Dalton belch forth death quite as well as Vandermesch's. It is not so in the war of the pen: only the artillery of the good cause destroys all its opponents. Give high pay to the best gunners to support the bad cause: promise the senator's fur and ermine to Mounier, Bergasse to Lally; give eight hundred farms to J. F. Maury; make Rivarol captain in the Guards; oppose to them the poorest scribbler with right on his side; the good man will do more than the greatest scoundrel. France was flooded with pamphlets against all her supporters; the Marquis of Favres placarded royalist leaflets in the taverns: what did all this produce? Contrary [*to their expectations*] Marat boasts that he induced the Parisians to march on Versailles, and I do believe

[1] Headed: A free Life or Death. THE OLD CORDELIER; JOURNAL. *EDITED by CAMILLE DESMOULINS, Deputy to the Convention and oldest member of the Jacobins.* Sub-heading: FOR AND AGAINST OR THE CONVERSATION OF TWO OLD CORDELIERS. No printer's name or address. The previous number has the name Desenne, rue des Moulins, No. 546.

he played a great part on that memorable day. For the honour of the press, let us never tire of repeating that it is not the best generals but the best cause that wins in the war against the enemies of liberty and the country. But however incontestable these principles may be, freedom of speech and writing is not an article in the declaration of rights more sacred than any of the others, which are all subject to the most imperious, the first of laws: the safety of the people * * * *

I saw that Pitt, having for four years vainly made use of clever agents, was now attempting to produce counter-revolution through ignorance, by the use of such men as Bouchotte, Vincent and Hebert.

I saw carried out a systematic defamation of all old patriots, all the most proved republicans; each commissary of the Convention, almost each member of the Mountain was slandered in the pages of the Père Duchesne. The imagination of the new conspirators was not taxed to invent a plan of counter-revolution: on the first day, Ronsin was to have come to the Convention, like Cromwel[*l*] to the Parliament, at the head of a group of his proud Reds, and repeating the remarks of the Père Duchesne, would have recited to us exactly the same speech as the Protector: "You are *jean foutres*, *viédases*, bawds, Sardanapaluses, scoundrels who drink the people's blood, who keep hired servants while the poor people starves, etc., etc."

I observed that the Hebertists were evidently in at least indirect alliance with Pitt, since Pitt gained most of his strength from the pages of Hebert's journal, and had only to make him execute some senseless movements and to reprint the pages of the Père Duchesne, in order to discomfit the opposition party and detach the people from all those who in the three Kingdoms pray for a revolution, by pointing to the madness of these pages, by repeating perpetually to the English:—Are you still envious of this French liberty; would you prefer to have that bloodstained goddess whose high priest[*s*], Hebert, Momoro and their like dare to demand that her temple shall be built like hers of Mexico, of the bones of three million citizens and who ceaselessly say to the Jacobins, the Commune, the Cordeliers, the words that the Spanish priests said to Montezuma, *The Gods are athirst*. . . .

1794 March: Paris Commune suppressed. The Left (Hebertist) leaders guillotined.
1794 April 5: The Right (Danton, Desmoulins, etc.) leaders guillotined.
1794 April-June: Indiscriminate guillotining.
1794 July 27, "9th Thermidor": Robespierre guillotined. Fall of the Mountain.
1794 Reaction and White Terror.
1795 April 1, "12th Germinal": Jacobin revolt suppressed.
1795 May 28, "1st Prairial": Jacobin revolt suppressed.
1796 February 29: General Napoleon Bonaparte in person closes the meeting-place of the Babouvist Society of the Panthéon.
1796 May 11: Arrest through treachery of Babeuf and his friends.
1796 September 9: Babouvists fail to raise the camp at Grenelle.

24 MANIFESTO OF THE EQUALS[1]

Equality of fact, final aim of the human art.
Condorcet: Table of the Human Soul, p. 329.

PEOPLE of FRANCE!

FOR fifteen centuries you have lived slaves, and therefore unhappy. It is now scarcely six years since you have begun to revive in the hope of independence, happiness and equality. [*Two words erased.*[2]]

EQUALITY! First need of nature, first demand of man, and chief bond of all legitimate society! French people! you have not been more favoured than the other nations that vegetate on this wretched globe! Always and everywhere poor humanity, in the hands of more or less adroit cannibals is the tool of every ambition, the pasture of every tyranny. Always and everywhere men were lulled by fine phrases; never and nowhere did they receive the fulfilment with the promise. From time immemorial we have been hypocritically told: *Men are equal:* and from time immemorial the insolent weight of the most degrading and most monstrous inequality has weighed down the human race. Since civilised society began, this finest possession of humanity has been unanimously recognised, yet not once realised; equality was only a fair and sterile fiction of the law. To-day when it is more loudly claimed, we are answered: Silence, wretches! real equality is but a chimera: be content with constitutional equality: you are all equal before the law. *Canaille*, what more do you want?—What more do we want? Legislators, governors, rich proprietors, listen in your turn.

We are all equal, are we not? This principle is uncontested: for without being mad one cannot say it is night when it is day.

Well, henceforward we are going to live and die equal as we were born; we desire real equality or death: that is what we want.

And we shall have this real equality at all costs. Woe to those who stand between it and us! Woe to those who resist so strong a desire!

The French Revolution is but the precursor of another revolution, far greater, far more solemn, which will be the last.

The people marched over the corpses of the kings and priests who banded against them. They will do the same to the new tyrants and new political Tartuffes who sit in the seats of the others.

What do we want more than equality in law?

We want this equality nor merely written down in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen: we want it in our midst, beneath the roofs of our houses. We will consent to everything for it; we will make a clean sweep to hold to it alone. Perish, if need be, all the arts as long as we have real equality![3]

Legislators and governors who have neither intellect nor honesty, rich

[1] Manifeste des Egaux. From the official "*Copy of the papers seized in the place where Babeuf was arrested.*" Imprimerie Nationale, a Paris, Nivose An V. (Written by Sylvain Maréchal.)

[2] Official note.

[3] Doubt over this sentence caused the Babouvists to reject this manifesto ultimately in favour of the "Analysis of the Doctrine of Babeuf." See next piece.

and heartless proprietors, you in vain try to neutralize our holy enterprise by saying: They only revive that agrarian law so often demanded before.

Slanderers, hold your peace in your turn, and in silent confusion, hear our demands, dictated by nature and based on justice.

An agrarian law, or the division of lands was the momentary wish of some unprincipled soldiers and some tribes moved by instinct rather than reason. We aim at something more sublime and more just, the COMMON good or the COMMUNITY OF GOODS! No more private property in land: *The earth is nobody's.* We claim, we will the common use of the fruits of the earth: *its fruits are everybody's.*

We declare that we can no longer permit that the huge majority of men toil and sweat for the service and at the pleasure of the tiny minority.

Long enough and too long have less than a million individuals disposed of what belongs to over twenty millions of their likes and their equals.

End at last this crying scandal, scandal our descendants will not credit! Vanish at last, revolting distinctions of rich and poor, great and little, masters and servants, governors and governed.

Let there be no difference now between human beings but in age and sex! Since all have the same needs and the same faculties, let there be for all one education and one standard of life! They are content with one sun and the same air for all, why should not the same portion and quality of food suffice for each?

But already the enemies of a state which is the most natural imaginable, declaim against us.

Disorganisers and factious men, they say to us, all you wish are massacres and booty.

PEOPLE of FRANCE,

We shall not waste our time in answering them; we shall tell you: The holy enterprise which we are organizing has for its only aim to end civil dissension and the poverty of the people.

Never has more vast a design been conceived and executed. At long intervals some men of genius, some sages have spoken of it in a low and trembling voice. None of them have had the courage to tell the whole truth.

The moment for great measures has come. The evil is at its height, it covers the face of the earth. Chaos has reigned there under the name of politics too many centuries. Everything must be in order and resume its place. Let the elements of justice and happiness crystallize at the voice of Equality. The time has come to found the REPUBLIC OF EQUALS, that great guesthouse of all mankind. The days of restitution have arrived. Weeping families take your seats at the common table, nature spreads for all her children.

PEOPLE of FRANCE,

For you, then, was reserved the purest of all glories. Yes, it is you that will first offer the world that touching sight!

Ancient habits, archaic prejudices again try to prevent the establishment of the *Republic of Equals*. The organising of real equality, the only state which answers all requirements without making victims or costing sacrifices, perhaps will not at first please everyone. The egoist and ambitious man will scream with rage. Those who possess unjustly will cry out, injustice! Their exclusive delights, their solitary pleasures, their personal ease will leave bitter longings in the hearts of some individuals who have grown effete by their neighbour's toil. Lovers of absolute power, and worthless tools of arbitrary authority, will find it hard to bring their proud chiefs to the level of equality Their short-sight cannot penetrate into the near future of the common good; but what is the power of a few thousand malcontents against the mass of men, entirely happy and wondering that they sought so long for what was beneath their hand.

On the morrow of this true revolution they will say: What, was the common good so easy? We had but to will it. Ah, why did we not will it sooner? Was it necessary to repeat it to us so often? Yes, without doubt, but one man on earth more rich and powerful than his fellows, his equals, shatters the equilibrium; and crime and unhappiness arise on earth.

PEOPLE of FRANCE,

By what sign in the future must you recognise the excellence of a constitution? . . . . That which is entirely founded on real equality is the only one that can suit you and satisfy all your wishes.

The aristocratic Charters of 1791 and 1795 riveted your chains instead of breaking them. That of 1793 was a great step in fact toward real equality, it had never been approached so near before but it did not achieve the goal; or arrive at the common good, whose great principle it yet so solemnly consecrated.

PEOPLE of FRANCE,

Open your eyes and hearts to the fulness of joy. Recognize and proclaim with us THE REPUBLIC OF EQUALS.

25 F. N. BABEUF: ANALYSIS OF HIS DOCTRINE.

ANALYSIS OF THE DOCTRINE OF BABEUF, PROSCRIBED BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTORY FOR HAVING TOLD THE TRUTH![1]

1. Nature has given to each individual an equal right to the enjoyment of all the goods of life.

2. The end of society is to defend this equality, often assailed by the strong and wicked in the state of nature and to augment, by the co-operation of all, the common enjoyments of all.

3. Nature has imposed on each person the obligation to work; nobody could, without crime, evade his share of the common labour.

[1] This was adopted by the Secret Directory as its official manifesto in preference to No. 24. The translation given above is J. Bronterre O'Brien's from the Appendix to his translation of Buonarroti's *Histoire de la Conspiration pour l'Egalité*, p. 318 (ii, 137, in the original).

4. Labour and enjoyments ought to be common.

5. There is oppression wherever one part of society is exhausted by labour and in want of everything, whilst the other part wallows in abundance without doing any work at all.

6. Nobody could, without crime, exclusively appropriate to himself the goods of the earth or of industry.

7. In a veritable society there ought to be neither rich nor poor.

8. The rich who are not willing to renounce their superfluities in favour of the indigent, are the enemies of the people.

9. No one can, by accumulating to himself all the means, deprive another of the instruction necessary for his happiness. Instruction ought to be common to all.

10. The end of the French Revolution is to destroy inequality, and to re-establish general prosperity.

11. The Revolution is not terminated, because the rich absorb all valuable productions, and command exclusively. Whilst the poor toil like real slaves, pine in misery, and count for nothing in the State.

12. The Constitution of 1793 is the veritable law of Frenchmen, because the people has solemnly accepted it; because the Convention had not the right to change it; because to succeed in superseding it, the Convention has caused the people to be shot for demanding its execution; because it has hunted and massacred the deputies, who performed their duty in defending it; because a system of terrorism against the people, and the influence of emigrants, have presided over the fabrication and pretended acceptation of the Constitution of 1795, which, nevertheless, had not a quarter of the number of suffrages in its favour that the Constitution of 1793 has obtained; because the Constitution of 1793 has consecrated the inalienable right of every citizen to consent to the laws, to exercise political rights, to meet in assembly, to propose what he deems useful, to receive instruction, and not to die of hunger; rights which the counter-revolutionary Act of 1795 has openly and completely violated.

13. Every citizen is bound to re-establish and defend, in the Constitution of 1793, the will and happiness of the people.

14. All the powers emanating from the pretended Constitution of 1795 are illegal and counter-revolutionary.

15. Those who have used violence against the Constitution of 1793 are guilty of high treason against the nation.

26 SOLDIER, STOP AND READ[1]

THE insidious and perverse Government, whose luxuriousness is an insult to the general poverty, has at last raised the mask: making a frontal attack on liberty it has dared audaciously to close and calumniate shamelessly the patriotic meetings.[2] It was in these places that the

[1] Grey paper, no printer's name or date. One of the flood of leaflets issued by the Babouvists. This particular one provoked a reply from the " loyal " soldiers of the 1st division of the Army of the Interior—an address written for them and published by Solignac, their adjutant-general.

[2] Of the Babouvist Society of the Panthéon.

energetic men of the 14th July, the 10th August, the 13th Vendemiare were watching over the rights of the People, and barely escaped from the prisons and knives of the royalists, devoted themselves again to the Revolution.

They were exposing the return of the émigrés, which had grown so excessively that the list of erasures exceeds that in which they were held up to the contempt of men and the vengeance of the law! They were demanding loudly for your families the support that was so justly assured them by the law, and for you finally, the goods which the country owes you for having shed your blood for her against the Kings, and which so many decrees have justly promised you. The Directory itself had at first favoured these Meetings, as though an unjust and arbitrary power could love publicity, evidence and truth. Patriots trustingly and in good faith attended them in crowds. The trap was adroitly hidden: they fell in: devotion and good faith calculate little. They do not repent: they acted as free men. In vain are they called anarchists. Even to-day Europe, more just, distinguishes from that name the Friends of Equality: unbiassed posterity will confirm that judgment.

But whence comes this audacity on the part of a few men clothed in a transient authority? Citizen soldiers! they found their hope of the success of their crime upon your courage. They say aloud, 'Our soldiers will defend us' .... You! Their soldiers! ! The conquerors of tyrants will support tyranny! ! ! Disillusion yourselves, tyrants and corrupters! It is in vain that you use distinctive clothes, unjust largesses, brandies and liqueurs in attempts to gain partisans and confuse the judgment of our brothers. Their hearts are not traitors to the country or disobedient to her voice. Will the methods which exposed the crime of Capet and ruined that tyrant,[1] succeed in your case? No! citizen soldiers! You will not fire on your brothers as in Germinal and Prairial.... No more shall your blows go astray! Turn them against tyranny; this glorious triumph is yet yours. Like the Greeks of Asia who were dragged with armies of Xerxes, you will hear the cry of our common country! You will read these lines that your brothers write on the road you traverse![2] and if the day comes, that final day of a just vengeance then you will find out who yet opposes your return to your hearths, or you will found with us EQUALITY and the COMMON GOOD.

27 F. N. BABEUF: DRAFT OF A DECREE[3]

FRAGMENT OF A DRAUGHT OF AN ECONOMICAL DECREE

ART. 1. There shall be established in the Republic a grand national community.

2. The national community holds proprietorship of the possessions hereinafter mentioned—to wit:—

The possessions which, being declared national, were not sold up to the 9th Thermidor of the Year II.[4]

[1] Louis XVI.
[2] This pamphlet was also posted as a placard.
[3] This was apparently abandoned unfinished. It is the only indication of the policy Babeuf would have pursued to enforce his Socialism. The translation is again Bronterre O'Brien's (p. 418—ii, 305, in Buonarroti).
[4] 1794

The possessions of the enemies of the Revolution which the decrees of the 8th and 13th Ventose of the Year II had vested in the unhappy poor.

The possessions forfeited, or to be forfeited, to the Republic in consequence of judiciary condemnations.

The buildings now in occupation for the public service.

The possessions which the communes enjoyed previously to the law of the 10th June, 1793.[1]

The possessions appropriated to hospitals, charitable institutions, and establishments for public instruction.

The lodgings occupied by needy citizens, in execution of the proclamation to the French on the. . . .[2]

The possessions which may be voluntarily abandoned to the Republic by their present owners.

The usurped possessions of such as have enriched themselves in the exercise of public functions.

The possessions of which no use is made by their present holders.

3. The right of succession, whether by inheritance[3] or will, is abolished. All the wealth actually possessed by individuals shall lapse, at their decease, to the national community.

4. Will be considered as actual possessors the children of a father now living, who are not called by the law to form part of the armies.

5. Every French person, of either sex, who makes a voluntary surrender to the country of all his effects, and devotes to it his body, and whatever service he is capable of, is a member of the great national community.

6. Old men who have attained their sixtieth year, and the infirm, if they are poor, are, of right, members of the national community.

7. As also, all young persons brought up in the national houses of education.

8. The possessions of the national community are employed in common by all its valid members.

9. The grand national community maintains all its members in an equal and honourable mediocrity; it provides them with all they want.

10. The Republic invites all good citizens to contribute to the success of reform by a voluntary surrender of their possessions to the community.

11. After the date of . . . no one can be a civil or military functionary who is not a member of the said community.

12. The grand national community is administered by local magistrates, freely chosen by its members, agreeably to the laws, and under the direction of the supreme administration.

13. . . . . [lost].

[*There follow eight long fragments, headed thus: Of occupations in common. Of the distribution and use of the possessions of the National Government. Of the administration of the National Community. Of*

[1] See No. 19.
[2] *i.e.*, a proclamation to be issued by Babeuf upon the success of his insurrection.
[3] *i.e.*, inheritance due to intestacy.

Commerce. Of Transport and Conveyance. Of Contributions. Of Debts. Of Money.]

1797. May 26: Execution of Babeuf.
1799. November 9, "18th Brumaire": *Coup d'état of* Napoleon Bonaparte.
1804. Napoleon proclaimed Emperor

Chapter II

Intermediate

SECTION I. *Ireland*, 1786
SECTION II. *The Nore Mutiny*, 1797
SECTION III. *The Revolution of* 1830

Section I

Ireland, 1786-1803

28 Letter addressed to the Munster Peasantry, July 1 1786
29 Declaration of the Belfast Volunteers, July 14 1791
30 Oath of the United Irishmen (first form) 1792
31 Oath of the United Irishmen (later form) 1795
32 Proclamation intended for May 24, by John Sheares 1798
33 Proclamation of Robert Emmet, July 23 1803

Introduction

THE French Revolution had, in spite of its national character, certain repercussions in Europe. For the most part these were insignificant, and the Batavian, Helvetian, Parthenopean and similar republics depended on French arms entirely for their existence. In one country alone—Ireland—were the effects serious.[1]

Great discontent, not only with the English and Protestant domination, but also with clerical exactions (Document 28), had been long present in Ireland, and the unhappy country had hardly seen a quiet year since Cromwell's days. Just previously to the French Revolution certain ameliorations for the mass of the people had been accomplished. The arming of a specifically Irish force, the Volunteers, had given sufficient force to the Irish (Protestant) Parliament to assert a certain independence, and a few concessions had been made to the Catholics. The influence of the French Revolution was swiftly felt (Document 29), and in 1792 was formed the United Irishmen, a society including Protestants and Catholics and with a large sprinkling of enlightened and intellectual leaders (Documents 30 and 31).

At first this union seemed to contain the materials of another French Revolution. But the religious differences which have always torn Ireland gradually began to operate, and, more potent than these, the preponderance of peasants changed it into an agrarian and Catholic movement. No doubt also the change of front of Pitt's government withdrew some of its middle-class supporters. In any case, between 1792 and 1798, the movement changed its character into that of a purely peasant revolt. It lost its last leader of note, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, in 1798, and when it broke out into open war, proved an ordinary peasant rising, brutal and purposeless (Document 32)—without a programme, merely the reaction to intolerable wrong. Its suppression was as bloody as its outbreak.

This revolution had two interesting pendants. In 1803, Robert Emmet (Document 33) led a revolt in Dublin almost exactly similar in character.[2] This was suppressed almost as soon as it broke out, but Robert Emmet remains a pathetic and heroic figure for many Irishmen. The second was the Mutiny at the Nore just previous to the Irish outbreak. But this deserves a separate section.

NOTE.—Essential for this period is, of course, James Connolly's *Labour in Ireland*, ch. iv-ix. For the actual events of the revolt, and its preparations, it is still, perhaps, sufficient to go to W. H. Maxwell's *History of the Irish Rebellion of* 1798. Reference should also be made to T. Moore, *Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald*, the *Life* of T. Wolfe Tone, and the trials of the rebels in *State Trials*, Vols. 27 and 28.

[1] I omit England intentionally. In spite of appearances I cannot believe that Godwin, the anti-popular philosopher, and Tom Paine, who was here the extreme Left, in France the Right of 1793 represent a real revolutionary movement. See particularly W. T. Laprade, *England and the French Revolution*. To defend this position here would take too long; but briefly it is this: (1) The movement was a small, aristocratic reform movement, once patronised by Pitt himself, Fox and the Duke of Portland; (2) It suited Pitt, in order to divide the Whig Party and assure his power to raise a false bogey of Jacobinism and persecute insignificant academic persons such as Thelwall with "unjust and vindictive" (Holland Rose) prosecutions; (3) The evidence of conspiracy to rebel and of sedition, is worthless; (4) The movement was unpopular and had no connection with the economic changes then occurring. It died an easy death after Pitt's repressive laws of 1796.

[2] The first sentence of his Large Proclamation confiscates all ecclesiastical property. No other general principles are proclaimed therein: merely administrative details.

Documents

1779 Growth of the Volunteers secures Free Trade.
1782 Independence of the Irish Parliament.

28 LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE MUNSTER PEASANTRY, JULY 1, 1786

TO obviate the bad impression made by the calumnies of our enemies, we beg leave to submit to you our claim for the protection of a humane gentry, and humbly solicit yours, if said claim shall appear to you to be founded in justice and good policy.

In every age, country and religion the priesthood are allowed to have been artful, usurping and tenacious of their ill-acquired prerogatives. Often have their jarring interests and opinions deluged with Christian blood this long-devoted isle.

Some thirty years ago our unhappy fathers[1]—galled beyond human sufferance—like a captive lion vainly struggling in the toils, strove violently to snap their bonds asunder, but instead rivetted them to more tight. Exhausted by the bloody struggle, the poor of this province submitted to their oppression, and fattened with their vitals each decimating leech.

The luxurious parson drowned in the riot of his table the bitter groans of those wretches that his proctor fleeced, and the poor remnant of the proctor's rapine was sure to be gleaned by the rapacious priest, but it was blasphemy to complain of him; Heaven, we thought, would wing its lightning to blast the wretch who grudged the Holy Father's share. Thus plundered by either clergy, we had reason to wish for our simple Druids again.

At last, however, it pleased pitying Heaven to dispel the murky cloud of bigotry that hovered over us so long. Liberality shot her cheering rays, and enlightened the peasant's hovel as well as the splendid hall. O'Leary told us, plain as a friar could, that a God of universal love would not confine His salvation to one sect alone, and that the subjects' election was the best title to the crown.

Thus improved in our religion and our politics * * * we resolve to evince on every occasion the change in our sentiments and hope to succeed in our sincere attempts. We examined the double cause of our grievances and debated long how to get them removed, until at length our resolves terminated in this general peaceful remonstrance.

Humanity, justice and policy enforce our request. While the tithe farmer enjoys the fruit of our labours, agriculture must decrease, and while the griping priest insists on more from the bridegroom than he is worth, population must be retarded.

Let the legislature befriend us now, and we are theirs for ever. Our sincerity in the warmth of our attachment when once professed was never

[1] The "Whiteboys."

questioned, and we are bold to say no such imputation will ever fall on the Munster peasantry.

At a very numerous and peaceable meeting of the delegates of the Munster peasantry, held on Thursday, the 1st day of July, 1786, the following resolutions were unanimously agreed to, viz.:—

Resolved—That we will continue to oppose our oppressors by the most justifiable means in our power, either until they are glutted with our blood or until humanity raises her angry voice in the councils of the nation to protect the toiling peasant and lighten his burden.

Resolved—That the fickleness of the multitude makes it necessary for all and each of us to swear not to pay voluntarily priest or parson more than as follows:—

Potatoes, first crop, 6s. per acre; do. second crop, 4s.; wheat, 4s.; barley, 4s.; oats, 3s.; meadowing, 2s. 8d.; marriage, 5s.; baptism, 1s. 6d.; each family confession, 2s.; Par. Priest's Sun. Mass, 1s.; any other, 1s.; Extreme Unction, 1s.

Signed by order,
WILLIAM O'DRISCOL,
General to the Munster Peasantry[1]

29 DECLARATION OF THE BELFAST VOLUNTEERS, JULY 14, 1791

DECLARATION of the Volunteers and inhabitants at large of the Town and Neighbourhood of Belfast on the subject of the French Revolution.

Unanimously agreed to at an Assembly held by public notice on the 14th of July, 1791.

COLONEL SHARMAN, President.

Neither on marble, nor brass, can the rights and duties of men be so durably registered as on their memories and on their hearts. We therefore meet this day to commemorate the French Revolution, that the remembrance of this great event may sink deeply into our hearts, warmed not merely with the fellow feeling of townsmen, but with a sympathy which binds us to the human race in a brotherhood of interest, of duty and affection.

Here then we take our stand, and if we be asked what is the French Revolution to us, we answer, much. Much as men. It is good for human nature that the grass grows where the Bastile stood. We do rejoice at an event that means the breaking up of civil and religious bondage, when we behold this misshapen pile of abuses, cemented merely by custom, and raised upon the ignorance of a prostrate people, tottering to its base, to the very level of equal liberty and commonwealth. We do really rejoice in this resurrection of human nature, and we congratulate our brother man coming forth from the vaults of ingenious torture and from the cave of death. We do congratulate

[1] Quoted in Connolly, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

the Christian world that there is in it one great nation which has renounced all ideas of conquest, and has published the first glorious manifesto of humanity, of union and of peace. In return we pray to God that peace may rest in their land, and that it may never be in power of royalty, nobility, or a priesthood to disturb the harmony of a good people, consulting about those laws which must ensure their own happiness and that of unborn millions.

Go on, then—great and gallant people; to practise the sublime philosophy of your legislation, to force applause from nations least disposed to do you justice, and not by conquest but by the omnipotence of reason to convert and liberate the world—a world whose eyes are fixed on you, whose heart is with you, who talks of you with all her tongues; you are in very truth the hope of this world, of all except a few men in a few cabinets who thought the human race belonged to them, not them to the human race; but now are taught by awful example, and tremble, and dare not confide in armies arrayed against you and your cause.[1]

1792 January: Formation of the United Irishmen.

30 OATH OF THE UNITED IRISHMEN (FIRST FORM)

I, ..., in the presence of God, do pledge myself to my country, that I will use all my ability and influence in the attainment of an impartial and adequate representation of the Irish nation in parliament; and as a means of absolute and immediate necessity in the establishment of this chief good of Ireland, I will endeavour, as much as lies in my ability, to forward a brotherhood of affection, an identity of interests, a communion of rights and an union of power, among Irishmen of all religious persuasions, without which, every reform in parliament must be partial, not national, inadequate to the wants, delusive to the wishes, and insufficient to the freedom and happiness of this country.

31 LATER FORM (1795)

In the awful Presence of God,

I, ..., do voluntarily declare that I will persevere in endeavouring to form a brotherhood of affection among Irishmen of every religious persuasion; and that I will also persevere in my endeavours to obtain an equal, full and adequate representation of all the people of Ireland.

I do further declare that neither hope, fears, rewards or punishments, shall ever induce me, directly or indirectly, to inform or give evidence against any member of this or similar societies, for any act or expression of theirs done or made collectively or individually, in or out of this society, in pursuance of the spirit of this obligation.

[1] Quoted in Connolly, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

1796 December: French fail to land in Bantry Bay
1798 May 19: Lord Edward Fitzgerald arrested.
1798 May 21: Arrest of the Sheares.
1798 May 23: Outbreak of the rebellion.

32 PROCLAMATION FOUND AMONG THE PAPERS OF JOHN SHEARES (TO BE ISSUED ON MAY 24)

IRISHMEN,

YOUR country is free and you are about to be avenged. That Vile Government which has so long and so Cruelly oppressed You, is no more: some of its most Atrocious Monsters have already paid the forfeit of their Lives, and the rest are in our hands. The National Flag, the Sacred Green, is at this Moment flying over the Ruins of Despotism, and that Capital which a few hours past witnessed the Debauchery, plots and Crimes of your Tyrants, is now the Citadel of Triumphant Patriotism and Virtue. Arise then, United Sons of Ireland; arise like a great and powerful people, Determined to be free or die, Arm Yourselves by every means in your power and Rush like Lions on your Foes; Consider that for every Enemy you disarm, you arm a friend and thus become doubly powerful; In the Cause of Liberty, inaction is Cowardice, and the Coward shall forfeit the property he has not the Courage to protect, Let his Arms be seized and transferred to those Gallant Spirits who want, and will use them. Yes, Irishmen, we swear by that eternal Justice, in whose Cause you fight, that the brave Patriot, who survives the present glorious Struggle, and the family of him who has fallen, or shall fall hereafter in it shall Receive from the hands of a grateful Nation, an ample recompence out of that property which the Crimes of our Enemies have Forfeited into its hands, and his Name shall be Inscribed on the National Record of Irish Revolution, as a glorious Example to all posterity; But we likewise swear to punish Robbery with death and infamy.

We also swear, that we will never Sheathe the Sword until every being in the country is restored to those equal Rights, which the God of Nature has given to all men, Until an Order of things shall be established in which no Superiority shall be acknowledged among the Citizens of Erin, but that of Virtue and Talent.

Many of the Military feel the love of Liberty glow within their Breasts and have joined the National Standard: receive with open Arms, such as shall follow so glorious an Example, they Can render signal service to the Cause of freedom, and shall be rewarded according to their deserts. [But for the Wretch who turns his sword against his Native Country, let the National Vengeance be visited on him, let him find no quarter, Two other Crimes demand.[1]]

Rouse all the Energies of your Souls; call forth all the Merit and abilities which a Vicious Government Consigned to obscurity, and under the Conduct

[1] John Sheares disavowed this passage at the trial.

of your Chosen Leaders March with a Steady Step to Victory; heed not the Glare of hired Soldiery, or Aristocratic Yeomanry, they cannot stand the Vigorous Shock of Freemen. Their Trappings and their arms will soon be yours, and the Detested Government of England to which we Vow eternal hatred, shall learn, that the Treasures they [*sic*, "she," "it" erased] Exhausts on its accoutred slaves for the purpose of Butchering Irishmen, shall but farther enable us to turn their Swords on its devoted head.

Attack them in every direction by day and by night; avail yourselves of the Natural Advantages of your country, which are Innumerable, and with which you are better acquainted than they; Where you Cannot Oppose them in full force, Constantly harass their Rear and their flanks; Cut off their provisions and Magazines and prevent them as much as possible from Uniting their forces; let whatever Moments you cannot Devote to fighting for your Country, be passed in learning how to fight for it, or preparing the means of War, for War, War alone must occupy every mind, and every hand in Ireland, until its long-oppressed Soil be purged of all its enemies.

Vengeance, Irishmen, Vengeance on your Oppressors—Remember what thousands of your dearest friends have perished by their Merciless Orders; Remember their burnings, their rackings, their torturings, their Military Massacres, and their legal Murders. Remember ORR.[1]

1798 September 7: Surrender of the French General Humbert
1798 November 19: Death of T. Wolfe Tone
1798-1799: Terror in Ireland
1800 The Union.
1803 July 23: Revolt of Robert Emmet

33 PROCLAMATION BY ROBERT EMMET, JULY 23

CITIZENS OF DUBLIN,

A BAND of Patriots, mindful of their oath, and faithful to their engagement as United Irishmen, have determined to give freedom to their country, and a period to the long career of English oppression.

In this endeavour, they are now successfully engaged, and their efforts are seconded by complete and universal co-operation from the country; every part of which, from the extremity of the north to that of the south, pours forth its warriors in support of our hallowed cause. Citizens of Dublin, we require your aid, necessary secrecy has prevented to many of you notice of our plan; but the erection of our national standard, the secret,[2] though long degraded, Green, will be found sufficient to call to arms, and rally round it every man in whose breast exists a spark of patriotism, or sense of duty; avail yourselves of your local advantages; in a city each street becomes a defile and

[1] Condemned for administering unlawful oaths: the jury was alleged to be intoxicated, and a leading witness later admitted that he had perjured himself. Nevertheless, Orr was executed.
[2] ? sacred.

each house a battery; impede the march of your oppressors, charge them with the arms of the brave, the pike, and from your windows and roofs hurl stones, bricks, bottles and all other convenient implements on the heads of the satellites of your tyrant, the mercenary, the sanguinary soldiery of England.

Orangemen: add not to the catalogue of your follies and crimes; already have you been duped to the ruin of your country, in the legislative union with its tyrant;—attempt not an opposition, which will carry with it your inevitable destruction, return from the paths of delusion; return to the arms of your countrymen, who will receive and hail your repentance.

Countrymen of all descriptions, let us act with union and concert. All sects, Catholic, Protestant, Presbyterian are equally and indiscriminately embraced in the benevolence of our object; repress, prevent and discourage excesses, pillage and intoxication, let each man do his duty, and remember that during public agitation inaction becomes a crime; be no other competition known than that of doing good; remember against whom you fight, your oppressors for six hundred years, remember their massacres, their tortures, remember your murdered friends—your burned houses—your violated females;—keep in mind your country, to whom we are now giving her high rank among nations, and in the honest terror of feeling, let us all exclaim, that as in the hour of trial we serve this country, so may God serve us in that which will be the last of all.[1]

1803 September 20: Robert Emmet executed.

[1]Text as given in the "State Trials."

Section II

The Mutiny at the Nore

34	Nore Seamen's Oath	1797
35	Nore Seamen's Song, No. 13	1797
36	Manifesto of the Delegates to their Countrymen, June 6	1797
37	Resolution of the Central Committee, on the *Sandwich*, June 7	1797

Introduction

THE conditions of service in the English Fleet in 1797 were abominable; semi-starvation and brutal tyranny were the rule, and recruits were obtained by the press-gang. Many of these were Irish, and there is little doubt that the United Irishmen were largely concerned in the Nore outbreak.

At last, in April, the sailors of the Fleet at Spithead broke out into mutiny. This mutiny was not in any sense political, and, although twice repeated, subsided as soon as the specific grievances as to food, etc., were alleviated. It was in the nature of an ordinary strike against bad conditions. In its course, however, the mutineers sent out delegates to implore the other Fleets to support them, and the Nore Fleet came out in support (Document 34). Nevertheless, when their grievances were remedied, the Nore seamen remained "out." Though protesting their loyalty (Documents 35 and 36) they continued to mutiny, blockaded the Thames and hung effigies of Pitt and Dundas at the yard-arm. There is reason to think that Parker and their other leaders kept from the rank and file the fact that their demands had been granted. Anyhow, when on June 7 (Document 37) the leaders exposed really revolutionary aspirations, the mutiny collapsed and the leaders were executed.

The movement is small in importance, although fascinating because of its documentary remains. It arose firstly from the atrocious conditions of the British Navy, and in the second place it was a branch of the operations of the United Irishmen. There is no evidence of it having been (as was alleged) engineered from on shore by "English Jacobins." (1)

[1] For the whole of this Section see C. Gill: *The Nava Mutinies o* 1797. (Manchester University publications.)

Documents

1797 April 16—May 16: The two Spithead mutinies.

1797 May 12: Outbreak at the Nore.

34 NORE SEAMEN'S OATH

I, ..., do voluntarily make oath and swear that I will be true in the cause we are embarked in and I will to the laying down of my life be true to the Delegates at present assembled, whilst they continue to support the present cause, and I will communicate to them at all times all such things as may be for the good of our undertakings and all conspiracies that may tend to the subversion of our present plan. I will also endeavour to detect and suppress as full as in my power everything that may lead to a separation of the unity so necessary [*for*] completing our present system.

1797 May 24: Refusal of second demands presented after the granting of the Spithead demands.

1797 May 29: Arrival of revolted ships of the North Sea Fleet revives mutiny.

1797 June 2—5: Thames blockaded by Nore Fleet.

35 NORE SEAMEN'S SONG, No. 13

All hail, brother seamen, that ploughs on the main,
Likewise to well-wishers of seamen of fame,
May providence watch over brave British tars,
And guide them with care from the dangers of wars.

Good Providence long looked with pity at last
For to see Honest Jack so shamefully thrashed,
But still held his arm for to let Jack subdue
The pride of those masters whose hearts were not true.

At Spithead Jack from a long silence was roused,
Which waked other brothers, who did not refuse
To assist in the plan that good Providence taught
In the hearts of brave seamen, that add long been forgot.

Old Neptune made haste; to the Nore he did come,
To waken his sons who had slept far too long.
His thundering loud voice made us start with surprise,
To hear his sweet words, and he bid us arise.

"Your brothers," says he, "his all firmly resolved,
To banish all tyrants that long did uphold,
Their crewel intentions to scourge when they please,
Sutch a set of bace villians you must instantly seize."

"So away, tell your brothers, near Yarmouth they lie,
To embark in the cause they will never deny.
Their hearts are all good, their like lyons I say,
I've furnished there minds and they all will obey."

"And when they arrive, which I trust they soon will,
Be steady and cautious, let wrangling lay still,
And love one another, my favour you'll keep,
Suckcess to King George and his glorious fleet."

36 MANIFESTO OF THE DELEGATES TO THEIR COUNTRYMEN[1]

THE DELEGATES OF THE DIFFERENT SHIPS AT THE NORE ASSEMBLED IN COUNCIL, TO THEIR FELLOW-SUBJECTS:—

COUNTRYMEN,

IT is to you particularly that we owe an explanation of our conduct. His Majesty's Ministers too well know our intentions, which are founded on the laws of humanity, honour and national safety—long since trampled underfoot by those who ought to have been friends to us—the sole protectors of your laws and property. The public prints teem with falsehoods and misrepresentations to induce you to credit things as far from our design as the conduct of those at the helm of national affairs is from honesty or common decorum.

Shall we who have endured the toils of a tedious, disgraceful war, be the victims of tyranny and oppression which vile, gilded, pampered knaves, wallowing in the lap of luxury, choose to load us with? Shall we, who amid the rage of the tempest and the war of jarring elements, undaunted climb the unsteady cordage and totter on the topmast's dreadful height, suffer ourselves to be treated worse than the dogs of London Streets? Shall we, who in the battle's sanguinary rage, confound, terrify and subdue your proudest foe, guard your coasts from invasion, your children from slaughter, and your lands from pillage—be the footballs and shuttlecocks of a set of tyrants who derive from us alone their honours, their titles and their fortunes? No, the Age of Reason has at length revolved. Long have we been endeavouring to find ourselves men. We now find ourselves so. We will be treated as such. Far, very far, from us is the idea of subverting the government of our beloved country. We have the highest opinion of our Most Gracious Sovereign, and

[1] Address handed to Lord Northesk on June 6.

we hope none of those measures taken to deprive us of the common rights of men have been instigated by him.

You cannot, countrymen, form the most distant idea of the slavery under which we have for many years laboured. Rome had her Neros and Caligulas, but how many characters of their description might we not mention in the British Fleet—men without the least tincture of humanity, without the faintest spark of virtue, education or abilities, exercising the most wanton acts of cruelty over those whom dire misfortune or patriotic zeal may have placed in their power—basking in the sunshine of prosperity, whilst we (need we repeat who we are?) labour under every distress which the breast of inhumanity can suggest. The British seaman has often with justice been compared to the lion—gentle, generous and humane—no one would certainly wish to hurt such an animal. Hitherto we have laboured for our sovereign and you. We are now obliged to think for ourselves, for there are many (nay, most of us) in the Fleet who have been prisoners since the commencement of the War, without receiving a single farthing. Have we not a right to complain? Let His Majesty but order us to be paid and the little grievances we have made known redressed, we shall enter with alacrity upon any employment for the defence of our country; but until that is complied with we are determined to stop all commerce and intercept all provisions, for our own subsistence. The military have had their pay augmented, to insult as well as to enslave you. Be not appalled. We will adopt the words of a celebrated motto[1] and defy all attempts to deceive us. We do not wish to adopt the plan of a neighbouring nation, however it may have been suggested; but we sell our lives dearly to maintain what we have demanded. Nay, countrymen, more: We have already discovered the tricks of Government in supplying our enemies with different commodities,[2] and a few days will probably lead to something more. In the meantime,

We remain, Dear Countrymen,
Yours affectionately,[3]

37 RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, JUNE 7

Resolution of the *Sandwich* committee (central committee) circulated to all the fleet.[4]

"To go to the Humber and make prizes, then sail to the Texel, then petition the French Convention for protection, as the only government that understands the rights of man."

1797 June 9: Parker's ship (*Sandwich*) gives signal to sail. Not obeyed. Mutiny collapses.

1797 June 16: Last ship surrenders.

[1] Dieu et mon droit.
[2] I do not know to what this refers.
[3] This text is that prepared for printing (Wilson's copy). Lord Northesk's ends: "Your loving Brothers, Red for Ever."
[4] Probably. See C. Gill: *The Naval Mutinies of* 1797, p. 222, note 2.

Section III

France, 1830-1831

38 Summary of the Republican programme, July 1830
39 Declaration of the Lyons chiefs of sections, November 23 1831

Introduction

FROM 1816 onwards the real ruler of Europe was Prince Clement Metternich of Austria. The diplomacy by which he achieved and maintained this rule does not here concern us; suffice it that all his endeavours were aimed at restoring and supporting the rotten and feeble despotisms which Napoleon had overthrown. Year by year his influence increased until fifteen years of success made the rule of despotism apparently impregnable. But during these years the economic changes which we call the Industrial Revolution were proceeding apace on the Continent. The ancient and corrupt system of Metternich was diametrically opposed to the interests of the rising bourgeoisie, and even more to those of the proletariat. His rigid opposition to the mildest form of Constitutionalism forced even the richer middle-class into revolutionary activity. In the years 1821-23 there were Constitutionalist upheavals in Spain, Piedmont and Naples—although the latter was largely Bonapartist in feeling—which were bloodily suppressed. In 1830, finally, in France, the legitimist King, Charles X, was dethroned and Louis Philippe, the Orleanist candidate, set in his place. This stimulated a national revolt from the Dutch in Belgium, and ephemeral constitutions were even granted in some German states. There were also serious disturbances in Italy. The Revolution in France was purely bourgeois: the right of voting was confined rigidly to the wealthiest classes: the King was, even in his appearance, with his green umbrella and civilian clothes, carefully middle-class: and very soon by corruption his ministers were able to control the Chamber. Nevertheless, during the stormy days of the actual Revolution of 1830, a Republican party did for a minute assume prominence. It represented not only the lower middle-class, but also the workers proper, and it is therefore interesting to observe that as late as 1830 there was practically no programme of even social reform, much less of economic revolution, elaborated, and that the maxims of 1789 were still, although with some misgivings, taken as men's only political guides (Document 38).

Hence, when a year later the silk-weavers of Lyons, being deprived of the fixed minimum wage they had for a little while acquired, broke out in revolt, and for ten days held the town,[1] they disavowed the Republican posters and announced (Document 39) pathetically enough their desire to uphold the existing authorities. Their complete lack of any plan or object led to the speedy collapse of the insurrection (December 3).

Such a state of division could not remain long. It is interesting to find, therefore, that in an abortive attempt at insurrection at Lyons in 1834, and the shooting in the rue Transnonain in Paris at the same date, the workers and the Republicans worked together. But after this event the Press laws and the growing reaction of Louis Philippe's administration drove the movement underground. We know no more until the movement comes suddenly into the light in 1848. In all this period of silence the industrialisation of

[1] November 23, 1831, to December 3, 1831.

France went on apace, until in 1848 Lille and Limoges were dens of horror which could worthily compare with the large towns of England itself.

NOTE.—For the Revolution of 1830 it is necessary to have recourse to French books. In particular:—Georges Weill, *Histoire du Parti Républicain*. E. Levasseur, *Histoire des classes ouvrières en France*, 1789–1870. Octave Festy, *Le mouvement ouvrier au début de la monarchie de Juillet*. For the revolt of Lyons, see especially J. B. Monfalcon, *Code Morale des ouvriers*. Louis Blanc's *Histoire des Dix Ans*, although prejudiced, is worth reading. It has been translated, but the translation has long been out of print. A useful book detailing the history of the secret revolutionary societies during Louis Philippe's reign is L. De la Hodde, *Histoire des Sociétés secrètes*. It is written by a police spy.

Documents

38 SUMMARY OF THE REPUBLICAN PROGRAMME, THE "PLAN OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN JULY"[1]

1 Convocation of a Constituent Assembly.
2 Limited election of officers in the army, but not of prefects.
3 Establishment of Juries.
4 Freedom of the Press.
5 General protection of property and abolition of lotteries and taxes on drink.
6 A non-mobile National Guard
7 Enrolment of volunteers.[2]

[Here M. Fabre inserts a diatribe against Jacobinism and declares the "party of the Mountain" no longer exists.]

8 Educational reform.

39 DECLARATION OF THE LYONS CHIEFS OF SECTIONS, NOVEMBER 23, 1831

MEN OF LYONS,—

WE the undersigned, chiefs of sections, all protest vigorously against the placard tending to disown legitimate authority, which has been published and posted with the signatures of *Lacombe*, syndic, *Charpentier*, *Frédéric*, and *Lachapelle*.

We call on all good workers to unite with us, as well as all classes of society friendly to that peace and union which ought to exist between all true Frenchmen.

Lyons, Nov. 23rd, 1831.

Signed
ROVERDINO
and 15 *others.*

[1] From the preface to A. Fabre's *La Révolution de* 1830 (pub. 1833). M. Fabre was the brother of Victorin Fabre, editor of the chief Republican paper, the *Tribune*. This document is a summary in 100 pages of their Republican programme, very dreary matter for the most part.
[2] The Republicans desired to conquer the Rhine frontier again.

Chapter III

The Revolutionary British Working Class, 1832-1854

SECTION I. *The Trades Unions*, 1832–1834
SECTION II. *The Chartists*, 1837–1854

Section I

The Trades Unions, England, 1832-1834

40	R. Owen: Address to the Operative Builders, August 26	1833
41	R. Owen: Lecture, September 8	1833
42	Proposals for a Builders' Guild, September 21	1833
43	Derby Committee Report, December 30	1833
44	J. E. Smith: Second letter on Associated Labour, March 22	1834
45	The Legacy of Robert Owen to the World, March 29	1834
46	J. E. Smith: "On the Prospects of Society," March 30	1834
47	*The Herald of the Rights of Industry*, on an eight-hours day, April 5	1834
48	Grand National Consolidated Trades Union Programme and Manifesto, April 15	1834
49	R. Owen: Lecture (on the *Pioneer*), April 27	1834
50	*The Crisis:* Leader deprecating Strikes, May 3	1834
51	The "Document" (London Tailors), May 23	1834

Introduction

THE Revolutionary Trades Union movement, which had Robert Owen for its nominal head, did not come into prominence until after the passing of the Reform Bill. Upon this measure, quite unjustifiably, the working classes had pinned many hopes. Popular enthusiasm had been worked upon so adroitly and effectively that the Whigs were able to play with the idea of armed revolt. The passing of this Bill, of course, merely transferred the power from the landowning classes to the urban employing classes. The middle classes having been admitted to power, the position of the working class was actually worsened, since the governing body opposed to them was so much the stronger. It was frequently remarked that the unreformed Parliament could never have withstood the Trades Union attacks which the Melbourne Government easily resisted. When the exhausting and noisy agitation for Reform was officially successful, the workers found that the change was for them only a change of masters. Not a single working man was enfranchised. Acrid comment was made by many that they had exchanged a despot who was tinged with feudal generosity for one who was both cruel, cowardly and mean. There are many signs of a reaction in favour of the Tories and of a tendency to speak well of the Duke of Wellington, Lord Liverpool and other Tory leaders.[1]

Trades[2] Unionism had, of course, made a previous appearance. In February, 1830, one Doherty called a meeting in Manchester from twenty organised trades and formed the "National Association for the Protection of Labour," an organisation which was to cover all trades. It had a certain ephemeral success, and it was stated at one time to have had a membership of 100,000, but it failed to give any useful support to its members in industrial disputes and by the middle of 1832 had entirely disappeared. At the same time was founded the Builders' Union, which played so important a part in the Owenite movement, but it did not become considerable in size until the later part of the year 1832.

The condition of the working classes at this time may be compared to the conditions prevailing in Petrograd before the Revolution. The Industrial Revolution had thrown upon the market vast quantities of cheap and absolutely unskilled labour. They had traditions or recollections of better times in the past, but were rapidly becoming accustomed to casual and badly paid employment under squalid conditions. Such labour is always a field for the growth of mushroom Unions, which appear suddenly and grow to a great size, only to collapse quickly at the first serious difficulty. Arch's experiment in agricultural Trades Unionism had the same ending, and the fluctuating character observable in the dockers' and general labour Unions to-day (1919) is due to similar causes.

[1] See p. 94.

[2] Observe: "Trade Union" a Union (like the Boilermakers') covering one trade; " Trades Union " a Union (like the I.W.W.) covering all, or a number of trades.

The Operative Builders, in this period, who were the least casual and degraded, formed the Union which showed the greatest signs of stability; the Consolidated Union, which accepted anybody, met with the heaviest fall.

Not until the year 1832 can the Trades Union movement be said to begin. The Operative Builders' Union did not come into prominence until the autumn of that year. It was made up of the organisations of seven branches of building: masons, joiners, plumbers, painters, plasterers, bricklayers and builders' labourers. Although confined to the building trades, it was sometimes spoken of as the General Trades Union. The Press and employers of the time, who still regarded Trades Unionism as an outrage, spoke of it in exaggerated terms, but in the autumn of 1833 it had only 40,000 members. Nevertheless, the tide of working-class opinion was definitely turning away from political action. The National Union of the Working Classes, which was largely responsible for the noisiest agitation for the Reform Bill, at the end of 1833 was left "in a state of much depression," says Francis Place—and comments irritably upon the "nonsensical doctrines of Robert Owen." The political Radicals, such as Henry Hunt, although they do not oppose the movement, make no attempt to lead it or interfere with it in any way. Bronterre O'Brien, for example, in the *Poor Man's Conservative*, gives occasional praise to the movement, but far more room to reports of the House of Commons. On the other hand, the Unionist journals, the *Crisis* and *Pioneer*, write and act as though Parliament did not exist.

The movement could not become revolutionary until it was furnished with a programme. This was provided it from outside, by one man—Robert Owen.

Owen[1] was a self-made man, a successful cotton spinner of Lanarkshire. An untiring propagandist, he had added prestige owing to his success in business. Before he took over the management of New Lanark, the district presented the appearance of semi-savage degradation which was usual in British manufacturing towns of that time. The dreadful conditions of those days will be described more in detail later. Something approaching them can still be seen in the worst districts of Liverpool. Out of this unpromising material Owen made a model community. His factory was a continual wonder to the neighbouring employers and an oasis of civilisation in a wilderness of savagery. In spite of the money he spent on his workers, his business was a commercial success, and this gave his suggestions considerable weight in the eyes of other members of his class. For a long time he was listened to with the greatest deference: bishops took the chair for him, and peers attended his meetings.

As his ideas developed, however, it became clear to him that the root cause of the degradation and immorality about him was competition[2] and the remedy Communism. He first popularised the word "Socialism," but preferred to speak of co-operation. Most of his life's work, in fact, belongs rather to the history of co-operation than of revolutionary Socialism.

[1] See Lloyd Jones's *Life*, etc., *of Robert Owen*.
[2] See particularly *The Legacy of Robert Owen* (Document 45).

In order to give practical exposition to the new development in his views he spent some years in founding Communist colonies, chiefly in America. These, unlike his New Lanark experiment, were dismal failures. Exception must be made of the Ralahine experiment in 1831, which was broken up by external interference.[1] This period of Owen's life lasts from 1824 to 1832, when he returned to England in no way disillusioned, to find that his doctrines had spread in his absence and that he had a large band of devoted followers. He immediately began to occupy himself with a new method of realising the co-operative commonwealth—Labour Exchanges. The essential point of these was that the worker brought his work to the Institution and received in exchange, not money, but a Labour Note of so many hours, which he could exchange for a commodity in the Institute, which had "cost" an equal number of hours.[2] Owen believed that these would spread and eventually cover the country, so that the competitive system would collapse of its own accord.

This work—which in itself led to nothing—brought him, practically for the first time, into contact with the working classes. He found, somewhat to his surprise, that they were anxious to hear and adopt his principles. He observed the great growth of Trades Unionism, and it entered his head that here was another method of attaining his aims. The plans he proposed—given on p. 90—are couched in his usual vague and grandiose phrasing. The proposal was, essentially, for the Unions to found and support co-operative productive organisations. At the same time, they were to force up by strikes (p. 91) the standard of employment in private firms, and themselves use only the co-operative products. In the end these methods would lead to the defeat of the competitive system and the victory of the co-operators. The Unions would thus eventually take into their hands and run the various industries on a "guild" or syndicalist[3] basis. This was not worked out in detail, except for the building industry in the plan for a "Building Guild" (Document 42). Along with this were various disconnected plans, not proceeding from Owen, but approved by him, such as that for a Potters' Bank.

On August 20, 1833, he addressed the Operative Builders' Manchester Congress and found them in complete and enthusiastic agreement (p 90). From this time onwards he devoted a very large portion of his time to lecturing to Trade Unions and promoting their growth. The journal which at this time expressed his views most nearly, the *Crisis*, divides its space between the Unions and the Exchange: gradually the former pushes the latter out. In return, Owen was the recognised instructor and head of the movement.

Few leaders have received such unquestioning respect and obedience. None of his followers would speak of him, as they did later of "Bronterre" and "O'Connor," otherwise than as "Mr. Owen" or even "the benevolent Mr. Owen." They listened attentively to his interminable and verbose lectures upon subjects entirely alien to Trades Unionism. They never resented his

[1] See W. P. Ryan: *Irish Labour Movement*, chap. iii.
[2] Lloyd Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 251 *sqq*; for a full description.
[3] In Smith's case, syndicalist. See Document 46.

dictatorial and school-masterlike attitude or commented upon his entire lack of a sense of humour or of proportion.[1] The break which came eventually was due entirely to his own incompetence as a leader. He had no idea of tactics or of comparative importance. He was the best example of Theophrastus' Inopportune Man. He chose this period to call attention to his disbelief in orthodox Christianity. He entered into controversies which revived dying antagonisms and threatened, later, to turn every Owenite meeting into a theological battlefield. He insisted with far more vigour that writers and Unionist advocates should expound his theory that man's character "is formed for, and not by, the individual" than that they should do useful work in the building up of the Union. He was intolerant of any disagreement, however slight, with his theories.

Finally, certain of his principles were incompatible with the growth of the Union.

The first number of *The Herald of the Rights of Industry*—a Manchester Owenite paper, and more pure in its orthodoxy than any other[2]—argues for Owenism on the ground that as the State takes so much for the army, etc., from both masters and men, they will see that it is to their advantage to unite to recover this money and devise a state of society in which this should be unnecessary. This is typical of Owen's attitude. He opposed Parliamentary action, not on any of the grounds on which it is attacked to-day,[3] but because he believed that a voluntary agreement of masters and men would attain his aims. He disapproved vigorously of anything approaching a class-war attitude, and even censured verbal attacks on the employing classes. Much more vigorously did he oppose any active opposition. Such a man, at the head of a militant Trades Union movement, would inevitably come into conflict with his followers. The quarrel with Smith and Morrison (see Document 49) was only the logical outcome of the views Owen had always professed. One is, indeed, surprised to find that he advocated a strike for an eight-hour day (Document 41).[4]

Even before the full effect of the new tide of Trades Unionism could be felt, a serious struggle had been precipitated. The arrogant tone of the Liverpool builders was very largely responsible for provoking a struggle in the summer of 1833. It spread to Manchester, and in June the employers first produced the "Document," a formal renunciation of the Trades Union and a promise to refrain from any active support of it, which all their employees were required to sign. This conflict is typical of all those that followed,

[1] On May 1, 1833, Owen proclaimed the millennium. Writers in the *Crisis* refer to this respectfully as an accomplished fact, without, apparently, any sense of its absurdity.

[2] Organ of the Society of National Regeneration, one of the many associations inspired by Owen and then left derelict Fielden was its nominal founder.

[3] Unlike Smith and the Left in general. See p. 93.

[4] Most illuminating, in regard to the peculiar veneration paid to Owen, is the address by Ebenezer Elliott and others, on his rejection of the Free Trade agitation, beginning: "KIND AND DEAR SIR: You came among us—a rich man among the poor—and did not call us rabble. This was a phenomenon new to us. There was no sneer on your lips, no covert scorn in the tone of your voice. You met us as a fortunate brother ought to meet his affectionate but suffering brethren. We knew that you had been calumniated by our enemies; but we also knew that when men go to their great and last account, God will not ask them what men called them here. We saw benevolence beaming in your eyes, and from your voice we heard the words of peace and charity."

not merely in the presentation of the famous Document,[1] but in the unnecessarily arrogant and provocative tone of the men, their unwisdom in forcing a struggle as soon as they were organised, and the selfishness and blindness of the employers.

For the moment, however, the cloud was no bigger than a man's hand. The *Pioneer*, the first purely Trades Union periodical, was first published on September 7, 1833. It was edited by James Morrison, who, with J. E. Smith, who about this time took over the editing of the Owenite *Crisis*, formed the Left Wing of the movement, and consistently advocated a vigorous policy against the employers, on a class-war basis. The *Pioneer* soon attained the surprising circulation of 30,000; that of the *Crisis* increased rapidly from the 1,250 to which it had fallen in Owen's hands.

The exact date and manner of foundation, the constitution and character of the greatest organisation of this period are alike uncertain. We can only say that at some time in January, 1834, was founded, under the direct auspices of Robert Owen, the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union, an organisation which covered all trades and rapidly eclipsed its existing rivals. The necessary documents concerning its organisation are lost. It seems, however, to have been very loosely knit. It took over existing lodges and branches of Unions, and local Unions, without any alteration. It accepted workers of any trade, and "poached" considerably—for example, it organised the London builders. Attempts were later made, it is not certain with what degree of success, to reduce to coherence the organisation of the crafts within the Union. Reference is made to Lodges of Cabinet-makers and Chair-makers, of Miscellaneous Females, etc. It had a regular contribution of 3d. per week.[2]

This loose organisation was admirably adapted to gain the allegiance of the wretchedly-paid casual labourer of those days. In a short while it had reached the absolutely unparalleled membership of half-a-million, a number not reached again by any single Union in that century. The other Unions, of which there were only five of importance—the Builders' Union, the Leeds, Bradford and Huddersfield District Union, the Cotton Spinners' Union, the Potters' Union, and the Clothiers' Union[3]—were quickly eclipsed, and became mere appendages of the Consolidated Union, which now had uncontested possession of the title "The Trades Union." If the Builders' Union had excited dismay, it was nothing to the alarm excited by the Consolidated Union. It seemed as though the workers were about to "rush" the middle-

[1] The phrasing of the Document varied. A specimen is given in No. 51.

[2] See S. and B. Webb: *History of Trade Unionism* (1920 edn.), Appendix II, for the constitution How far this was a paper constitution I do not know.

[3] See p. 100. Of these Unions, the Builders' was the most important, but was already declining owing to the prolonged conflict initiated by Liverpool. Its decline was accelerated by the complete failure of the Manchester and Liverpool strikes in the winter, and it is moribund in 1834. However its failure passed unnoticed amid the success of the Consolidated. The Potters' and Cotton Spinners' Unions were Doherty's creations. The Potters' always remained small (about 8,000), the Cotton Spinners benefited by the impetus given by the Consolidated Union. The Clothiers' Union was apparently confined to Leeds, unless Webb's reference (*op. cit.*, p. 133) is a confusion with the Leeds, etc., District Union. About the latter little is known, but it is not the same society. All these Unions participated in the downfall of the Consolidated Union. No exact date can be fixed, however, except in the case of the Leeds. etc., District Union, the Potters' Union and the Cotton Spinners. The references to the various Unions in the periodicals of the time are so casual and slipshod that one often does not know which Union is meant.

class positions, just as the middle-class had rushed the Duke of Wellington's two years before. Employers swiftly began to band together for the use of the Document, and throughout the struggle treated the simplest trade demand as an outrage. Melbourne's Government was deeply alarmed and only awaiting an opportunity to strike at the Union.

The organisers of the Consolidated Union were full of confidence, as can be judged from the extravagant terms employed by the *Pioneer*, now its official organ. But there were very grave difficulties in its way. In November alone were three great strikes—the Glasgow Stonemasons, the Leicester Hosiers, and the "Derby Turn-outs"—all of which sooner or later turned to the Consolidated Union. The last, which was at once taken up by the Union, was by far the most important. 15,000 men and women had been locked out by the employers for joining the Union.[1] The attempt to support the men by setting them to work on co-operative production[2] was the first example of a method which the Union used in all the strikes in which it was involved. Typical also was the action of the employers. When the men who were organised did not at once strike, the employers locked them out for joining the Union. Each accession to the Consolidated Union was a source of weakness rather than strength.

The first organising delegate meeting of the Consolidated Union was held in February. By the beginning of March it was apparently at the height of its power (500,000 members). Such vertiginous progress would have turned the heads of wiser men than the leaders of the Consolidated Union. The excitement spread to the rank and file. The Union was faced with an epidemic of strikes. In January, the Worcester and Yeovil glovers came out. The London Gasworkers struck at the beginning of March. None of the strikes were successful, and, all the time, in addition the Union had the heavy burden of the widely-advertised Derby Turn-outs to support. All the members of the Union were asked to subscribe to these, and the columns of the *Pioneer* were full of the progress of the struggle. In February the "Derby brothers" were set to work on co-operative production, and the Labour Exchange offered to dispose of their goods, which was the occasion for a fresh outbreak of rejoicing. Both sides—Right and Left—Owen and Smith[3]—of the movement were sure of success.

There was already, however, an ominous sign of weakness. The Cotton Spinners—urged by Owen[4]—had decided to strike on March 1 for an eight-hours day. The employers ignored the notices, and the Union postponed the attempt to June 2. This was the first direct defeat in the struggle. But the first staggering blow did not come from the headlong unwisdom of the Unions or the malice of the masters, but from the Government. On March 15, six Dorchester labourers were charged, under an Act directed against the Nore mutineers of 1797, and dug out for this purpose, with administering unlawful oaths. They had merely sworn certain Tolpuddle labourers into

[1] Morrison first came into prominence through the Derby turn-out.
[2] See Document 43.
[3] See Documents 44 and 47.
[4] See 42 and 47.

the Union. There was no suggestion that they had used violence, had led a strike, or had incited to any breach of the peace. Nevertheless, they were all sentenced to the monstrous penalty of seven years' transportation. All the petitions and agitation of the Consolidated Union failed to secure any remission.

Disaster after disaster now began to assail the Trades Union. The much-advertised Derby Turn-outs were broken on April 26. At the end of the month the London Tailors came out and threw 20,000 men upon the funds of the Consolidated Union, already overburdened. The Executive[1] made vain attempts to stop the strikes and recall its members to orthodox Owenism: the only result was that the Shoemakers, forbidden to strike, left the Union and struck on their own account (June).

Before this, the Union had been forced to have recourse to levies to meet the rush of strikes. The frequency of these not only drove away members, but was a clear sign of growing financial embarrassments. One shilling per head was levied on February 19, a 1s. 6d. levy was ordered to meet the Tailors' strike (May 9), and a fresh levy of 6d. was called for on May 21, with a proclamation desiring the workers to form their own local funds. After this, records are lacking; but in any case the members of the Union in the first four weeks of May found themselves paying the very high trade subscription of 9d. a week where they had expected to pay practically nothing. The popularity of the Union rapidly declined. Three of the lesser Unions were submerged: the Builders, overwhelmed by unsuccessful strikes, abandoned their Guildhall and the organisation disappeared, the Leeds District Union was smashed by an unsuccessful strike on June 14, the Cotton Spinners were unable to survive the failure to raise a strike for the eight-hours day on June 2.[2]

In the middle of this welter of disaster, Owen engaged in a violent fight with Smith and Morrison, which assisted greatly in the final collapse.[3] As the struggle grew more bitter, Smith and Morrison grew more violent in their attacks on the employers. Robert Owen wrote to rebuke them in pompous and arrogant tones, and in one of his weekly lectures, on April 27, openly attacked the *Pioneer*. While the leaders were concentrating their attentions on mutual recrimination, trade matters went from bad to worse. "Strikes after strikes in thick succession rise,"[4] says Smith, in a remarkably sensible and intelligent appraisement of the situation. The Oldham tailors, who had followed their London brothers, were with difficulty persuaded back to work. On May 17, according to an official statement, the Union was supporting four important strikes—at Wellingborough, Worcester, Cambridge, and the relics of the turn-outs at Derby. The leaders in the *Crisis* are written in a tone of continually-growing depression. On July 12,

[1] See No. 48.

[2] I do not know what happened to the Clothiers' Unions. The Potters' Union remained strong for some time. It actually gained the recognition of a "Green Book of Prices" in 1835, and was not crushed till 1837, after an unsuccessful general strike.

[3] See Document 49.

[4] See Document 50.

it says: "One fatal blow succeeds another to accomplish the dissolution of the Grand Consolidated." It refers to a very serious blow—the Worcester delegate, Hall, one of the four members of the Executive, had absconded with a large amount of the funds. The Executive ruined its prestige by attempting to hush this up.

The mortal blow to the Union was, however, inflicted by Owen himself. In order to smash the Left wing of the Union, he forced Morrison from his place on the Executive in June and had his paper, the *Pioneer*, displaced from the position of official organ. By the end of July his continual attacks had driven Smith to resign, and in August he closed down the *Crisis* to prevent Smith writing at all. Thus he had expelled the two strongest members of the Union and ruined the circulation of the only important Unionist journals. When, on July 19, an accidental dispute led to a general lock-out of London Builders—organised by the Consolidated Union—the inevitable came. A congress called on August 20 accepted the death of the Union as a fact and transformed it into an Owenite propaganda society, called "The British and Foreign Consolidated Association of Industry, Humanity and Knowledge." The men out on strike slowly drifted back to work, and by 1835 there was no trace of the Union movement to be found. Previously, the workers had only lost in a falling market; led by the Grand Consolidated, they had lost even in a rising one. Under the influence of this experience they began again to turn to political agitation, and the democratic societies experienced a revival. The way was clear for Chartism.

Bibliographical Note

See the relevant chapter in S. and B. Webb: *The History of Trade Unionism* (iii), and M. Beer: *History of British Socialism*, I. (Pt. II, v, vi, and xii).

Apart from these there are no accounts of any value and nearly all the documents are lost. There is not even a file of the *Pioneer and Official Gazette*, which was run to replace Morrison's journal. The valuable papers which are available are: *The Herald of the Rights of Industry* (Manchester), *The Pioneer* (Birmingham and London), and *The Crisis* (London). Bronterre O'Brien's *The "Destructive" and Poor Man's Conservative* best gives the Parliamentary revolutionaries' attitude.

The *Lives* of Robert Owen by F. Podmore and Lloyd Jones hardly deal with this period at all, nor does his autobiography, now republished by Messrs. Bell at 2s. 4d. There is a passing account in *Shepherd Smith the Universalist*, a life of J. E. Smith by W. A. Smith.

Documents

1830 July: National Association for the Protection of Labour founded.
1831 (Summer): Operative Builders' Union formed.
1832 (Spring): National Association disappears.
1832 June: Reform Bill carried.
1832 September 3: Labour Exchange first opened.
1833 May 1: Exchange moved to Charlotte Street.
1833 June: Liverpool Building employers present "The Document."
1833 August 26: Mr. Owen read an address to the general meeting of the Operative Builders' Lodges in Manchester.

40 R. OWEN: ADDRESS TO THE OPERATIVE BUILDERS[1]

* * * The turn-out of the building operatives,[2] and the existing differences with their masters, will, I doubt not, tend greatly to effect a permanent good for both parties. It affords a fair opportunity to you, the producing classes (and masters and men are producers), quietly, calmly, but most effectively, to make a stand, at once, and put yourselves in your right position, and thereby gradually accomplish the great change required; that is, that individual competition, the bane of the producing class, shall cease among you; that machinery and chemistry, and all the arts and sciences, shall be made to work for you, and not, as at present, against you, that your children shall be well trained and instructed in all that is useful from their birth, that they may become men and women possessing superior dispositions, habits, manners and conduct, and that whatever is injurious or inferior may be speedily removed out of society, and be replaced by those things which are good and in all respects superior for the use of man. * * *

Now as you perceive that you alone have been taught to do anything beneficial for society, decide at once to form new arrangements, to re-organise yourselves, to produce and obtain a full supply of the best of everything for the whole population of Great Britain and Ireland, yourselves enjoying, as well as the upper and middle classes, superior food, houses, furniture, clothes, instruction for yourselves and children, and daily rational recreation, such as will improve your health and contribute to your happiness.

This you may now do and you may accomplish this change for the whole population of the British Empire in less than five years, and *essentially* ameliorate the condition of the producing class *throughout Great Britain and Ireland* in less than *five months*.

I know you will require assistance to form the great outline arrangements to effect this change, for you have to make and set in motion a new extraor-

[1] From the *True Sun*, which remarks: "The number of men in the Union exceeds 40,000; and they are daily increasing by hundreds."
[2] On September 24 a meeting of delegates was to be held to consider a "forward policy," and a general turn-out was commonly, though wrongly, anticipated.

dinary machine to perform all the business of society in a superior manner; but that assistance is at hand, and will be given to you under circumstances of disinterestedness such as the commercial world has seldom witnessed * * *[1]

1833 (Autumn): Cotton Spinners' Union revives.
1833 (Autumn): Potters' Union numbers 8,000 members.

41 R. OWEN: LECTURE, SEPTEMBER 8

AT THE CHARLOTTE STREET INSTITUTION

[*After quoting a report of two schools, good and bad, under the Poor Law, Mr. Owen considered the methods necessary to improve education.*]

* * * The first practical step will be to institute a maximum of time of daily labour, and a minimum of wages. Now, shall this maximum be in strict analogy with the immense increase of power of machinery, or shall we bend a little to meet the old prejudices of society? Can anyone be found to assert and maintain that eight hours per day will be too short for those who produce all wealth? Nay, I assert, on the contrary, that nothing but the grossest ignorance upon national wealth and prosperity would justify more than four hours per day; and these four hours would be found, under proper arrangements, to saturate the world with wealth. But who will be found to oppose the eight hours a day? Not Ministers, who have established 45 hours per week, for the black slaves, in the West Indies; they cannot oppose the forty-eight hours which are now recommended for the white slaves at home, who work three times as hard as those in the West Indies. This I know from personal observation, that one hour's work here is as much as three hours' work in that country. Well, we will begin, then, by establishing the eight hours a day. I may say, the fiat has gone forth, and that after the 1st March next, no white slave will be found to work more than eight hours a day.

42 PROPOSALS FOR A BUILDERS' GUILD, PUBLISHED IN THE "PIONEER" ON SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1833[2]

THE servile and deplorable condition to which the producers of wealth, throughout Great Britain and Ireland, have been reduced by competition with machinery and with each other, and the utter impossibility of any permanent improvement being effected while this com-

[1] A Mr. Hansam, builder, of Birmingham, had expressed a desire to assist Mr. Owen. (A strike had just ceased at his works). In consequence of this speech the Manchester meeting sent delegates to Birmingham with Mr. Owen to meet the delegates of the Birmingham builders, where, says the *Crisis* (III, 4) they " sat in consultation over the interest of mankind from seven in the morning till late in the evening; next day also from seven in the morning till seven in the evening; and I may venture to say, says Mr. Owen, that in these two days were accomplished for Britain and the world more than has been accomplished in any public or private meeting for the last five hundred years. The destruction of the old and the commencement of the new world are decided! "

[2] Cf.: " Declare to the existing masters that you are willing to admit them into your Union, if they choose to enter themselves as *workmen*, and that they will stand a chance of being elected to be your directors, your agents (if their disposition, qualifications and capabilities render them preferable to others for such situations); but that in future you will be no respecters of persons, and will elect only such men as will devote all the talents they possess, not for their individual accumulations, but for the common good." From an article " To the Operative Builders " by " Concord " in the first number of the *Pioneer*. These two documents should be read in connection. The proposal, not very clearly brought out here, was that the Builders should form a Guild which would work on a co-operative basis—and, in view of its command of labour, would drive out all the masters in time—and at the same time continue to function as a Trade Union.

petition shall be permitted to be continued, have elicited the following proposals, as a certain speedy and effectual mode of giving a new direction to the industry of the building classes, and as a means of placing them and their children, and their children's children, in a state of permanent independence.

UNION

To the United Working Builders of Great Britain and Ireland,

Proposals for the establishment of a National Association for Building, to be called "THE GRAND NATIONAL GUILD OF BUILDERS," to be composed of Architects and Surveyors, Masons, Carpenters and Joiners, Bricklayers, Plasterers, Slaters, Plumbers, Glaziers and Painters, Whitesmiths, Quarrymen and Brickmakers.

OBJECTS OF THE UNION

1 The general improvement of all the individuals forming the building class; insuring regular employment for all.

2 To insure fair remuneration for their services.

3 To fix a reasonable time for labour.

4 To educate both adults and children.

5 To have regular superior medical advice and assistance, and to make provision for the comfortable and independent retirement of the aged and infirm.

6 To regulate the operations of the whole in harmony, and to produce a general fund sufficient to secure all these objects.

7 To ensure a superiority of building for the public at fair and equitable prices.

8 To obtain good and comfortable dwellings for every member of the Union; extensive and well-arranged workshops; places of depot for building materials; provisions and clothing; halls for the meeting of the Lodges and Central Committees; schools and academies for the instruction of adults and children in morals and the useful sciences.

9 And also the establishment of Builders' Banks in the various districts in which the grand District Lodges shall be established.

MEANS OF EFFECTING THE OBJECTS OF THE UNION

Capital at least £15,000 in one or more shares of 5s. from each member of the Union, already sufficient in number to effect these objects.

1 Each class of the builders to be composed of men who have served five years' apprenticeship, and are above eighteen years of age * * *

[*There follow six more sections devoted entirely to the internal organisation of the Guild, and of no particular interest. The unit is to be the local Lodge, which will connect with the national and district movement by a hierarchy of committees.*]

1833 September 24: Builders' Union Delegate Conference approves of Owen's plans for co-operative societies and Labour Exchanges.

1833 November 16: Glasgow Stonemasons' Strike.

1833 November 25: Derby Turn-out begins.

43 REPORT OF THE DERBY COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 30, 1833

TO THE TRADES UNIONS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM. REPORT.

* * * Fellow countrymen—we are going to set the Derby people to work—we decline to contest the matter with the masters—we remove ourselves totally away from them. Every penny shall be applied to a re-productive end. The silk trade and the bobbin-net branch shall have warehouses and machinery of their own, and every thousand pounds of yours shall not only be maintained without diminution but shall be increased by the industry of Derby—shall be increased twofold.

With this view we call upon the machinists and working engineers of Glasgow and elsewhere to bethink themselves of the propriety of supplying a steam engine or engines to work the power looms. We call upon the men of Nottingham, Leicester, Macclesfield, Manchester, Congleton and Leek, to look out for, and supply such machines, as may be of instant use to the silk-throwsters, the spinners, the weavers and bobbin-net workpeople; if each will contribute in this way, the groundwork will be established of a weekly increase —and we know, from experience, that assistance of this kind may be more easily rendered than in any undefined object.

Of the unemployed builders in Derby suffering from this persecution, we intend to select as many as the funds will admit of, and the necessities of the case require, to erect workshops and factories, and, it may be, dwelling houses, for the use of this grand Union Association.

It will thus be seen, that instead of a wasteful expenditure of the Union levies, for the support of hundreds of unemployed, the sum, however small, may and must be augmented; it will be converted into manufactured goods—into stock of value, hourly and daily on the increase.

On behalf of the Committee,

JAMES MORRISON, *Secretary*

1834 January: Worcester and Yeovil Glovers' Strike.
1834 January: Grand National Consolidated Trades Union formed.
1834 February: First Organising delegate meeting.
1834 March: London Gasworkers' Strike.
1834 March 18: Dorchester Labourers convicted.

44 MARCH 22: J. E. SMITH ("SENEX"), IN THE "PIONEER"

SECOND LETTER ON ASSOCIATED LABOUR

THE Trades Unions would have come into being and would have combined as they are now combining, into one universal union, if the Whigs had never risen from that abject state in which they lay so long overwhelmed under Tory power, until Tory tyranny had abso-

lutely worn itself out. They have stepped into Tory places and would be as great as Tories, but ministerial greatness is dead and gone. It was paralysed with Lord Liverpool, and, after struggling through a few uneasy administrations, expired for ever under the Duke of Wellington.[1]

To us, brethren, it matters little who or what may be the men that direct the crazy machine called *the state*. We have little to do with them. They are so hampered by the evils of a long course of misrule, that, positively, they can do us no good if they would * * *

The practical object at which we aim is, the securing to every human being a fair share of the produce of his labour. We know that the operative manufacturer, and, in fact, the labourer of every description, requires sustenance, raw material and tools. These are derived from the reserved produce of former labour, which is termed *capital*. The amount of capital in this country is very great, but, brethren, it was you that gave it existence. What hours out of every twenty-four have you not employed in building it up! And what is it now it is reared? What but a vain pretence, unless you animate it: unless you give it thought and activity, the pyramids of Egypt (those monuments of a dreadful sacrifice of human labour to pride and superstition), are not more useless, while they may boast of being more durable. Reflect, though in the reflection, brethren, I know there is much anguish, how many of your fellow labourers, how many with whom you have communed in friendship, how many connected with you by the respected and the endeared ties of relationship, have sunk in toil and want; pale, sickening, and starving; while all the energies of their bodies and of their minds was given to the rearing of this mighty mass, this boasted *capital!* "It is reserved labour," cries McCulloch. "Ay, reserved," shout a hundred bloated capitalists over their French and Spanish wines, "reserved for our present and future prosperity!" From whom and out of what was it reserved? From the clothing and food of the wretched—from the refreshment of the weary—from the wages of those who sink exhausted on their hard pallets after sixteen hours of almost ceaseless labour * * *

We come forward generously and manfully, and invite the holders of this reserve labour, these capitalists, to associate themselves with us; and we propose to them, that, in dividing the future associated profits, every two thousand pounds advanced to the association shall receive the same emolument as an associated labourer. Let the holders of reserved labour chew the cud upon this proposition. They may be assured that it will not be made to them next year. Before the seasons shall have gone their next annual round, we shall be beginning, at least, to possess reserved labour of our own. Reserved labour, or capital, as they call it, will, with our activity and frugality, accumulate rapidly; and the means of this accumulation will be the subject of my next letter.

SENEX.

[1] The *Pioneer* was accused of favouring the Tories: "Some of our friends," says the leader of the previous issue, "are offended with us for speaking well of the Tories, but it is a law of good manners never to speak disrespectfully of the dead."

45 THE LEGACY OF ROBERT OWEN TO THE POPULATION OF THE WORLD (MARCH 29, 1834)

"*Sacred to Truth, without Mystery, Mixture of Error or Fear of Man.*"

MORE than half a century ago I discovered that there was some grievous error deep in the foundations of society, which created evil, and prevented the good which man by his nature was evidently destined, in some stage of his progress, to attain and permanently to enjoy.

From that period to the present, I have never ceased honestly and fearlessly to search for that truth which should enable me to detect the error, remove the evil and forever establish the good.

Having found this truth, and proved it to be such by the only criterion of truth known to man; that is, by its undeviating consistency with ascertained facts, I now give it to you, that through its influence you may be regenerated, your minds born again, and your posterity be made partakers of the endless blessings which this truth, and this truth alone, can ensure permanently for the human race.

This great truth which I have now to declare to you, is, that "the system on which all the nations of the world are acting is founded in gross deception, in the deepest ignorance or in a mixture of both. That, under no possible modification of the principles on which it is based, can it ever produce good to man; but that, on the contrary, its practical results must ever be to produce evil continually"—and, consequently, that no really intelligent and honest individual can any longer support it; for, by the constitution of this system, it unavoidably encourages and upholds, as it ever has encouraged and upheld, hypocrisy and deception of every description, and discouraged and opposed truth and sincerity, whenever truth and sincerity were applied permanently to improve the condition of the human race. It encourages and upholds national vice and corruption to an unlimited extent; whilst to an equal degree it discourages national virtue and honesty. The whole system has not one redeeming quality; its very virtues, as they are termed, are vices of great magnitude. Its charities, so called, are gross acts of injustice and deception. Its instructions are to rivet ignorance in the mind and, if possible, render it perpetual. It supports, in all manner of extravagance, idleness, presumption and uselessness; and oppresses, in almost every mode which ingenuity can devise, industry, integrity and usefulness. It encourages superstition, bigotry and fanaticism; and discourages truth, commonsense and rationality. It generates and cultivates every inferior quality and base passion that human nature can be made to receive; and has so disordered all the human intellects, that they have become universally perplexed and confused, so that man has no just title to be called a reasonable or rational being. It generates violence, robbery and

murder, and extols and rewards these vices as the highest of all virtues. Its laws are founded in gross ignorance of individual man and of human society; they are cruel and unjust in the extreme, and, united with all the superstitions in the world, are calculated only to teach men to call that which is pre-eminently true and good, false and bad; and that which is glaringly false and bad, true and good. In short, to cultivate with great care all that leads to vice and misery in the mass, and to exclude from them, with equal care, all that would direct them to true knowledge and real happiness, which alone, combined, deserve the name of virtue.

In consequence of the dire effects of this wretched system upon the whole of the human race, the population of Great Britain—the most advanced of modern nations in the acquirement of riches, power and happiness—has created and supports a theory and practice of government which is directly opposed to the real well-being and true interests of every individual member of the empire, whatever may be his station, rank or condition—whether subject or sovereign. And so enormous are the increasing errors of this system now become, that, to uphold it the government is compelled, day by day, to commit acts of the grossest cruelty and injustice, and to call such proceedings laws of justice and of Christian mercy.

Under this system, the idle, the useless and the vicious govern the population of the world; whilst the useful and the truly virtuous, as far as such a system will permit men to be virtuous, are by them degraded and oppressed.

Under this system, those who daily and hourly practise the act of poisoning the body, deranging the intellect, and reducing individuals to the lowest stage of human existence, are openly fostered and encouraged until they build palaces of temptations, to excite to every conceivable vice and crime, and at the same time teach almost a continued language of the vilest and most demoralizing oaths; while those who, to protect themselves and their helpless families, by their industry and good conduct, from these dire effects, meet together to aid and encourage each other in their wise and virtuous proceedings, and engage to do so by righteous oath, taken solely with a view to unite these, the producers of all good to society, in a virtuous bond of brotherhood and sisterhood, are hunted like beasts of prey, incarcerated in demoralizing prisons, subjected to a much worse than farcical trial, found guilty by ignorant and prejudiced individuals, and sentenced to a cruel, ignominious and grossly unjust punishment.

Men of industry, and of good and virtuous habits! This is the last state to which you ought to submit; nor would I advise you to allow the ignorant, the idle, the presumptuous and the vicious, any longer to lord it over the well-being, the lives and happiness, of yourselves and families, when, by *three days* of such idleness as constitutes the whole of their lives, you would for ever convince each one of these mistaken individuals that you now possess the power to compel *them* at once to become the abject slaves, and the oppressed portion of society which they have hitherto made *you*.

But all the individuals now living are the suffering victims of this accursed system, and all are objects of pity: you will, therefore, effect this great and glorious revolution without, if possible, inflicting individual evil. You can easily accomplish this most-to-be-desired object. Proceed with your Union on the principles which you have latterly adopted; they are wise and just, and wisdom and justice, combined with your Union, will be sure to render them for ever legal.

Men of industry, producers of wealth and knowledge, and of all that is truly valuable in society! unite your powers now to create a wise and righteous state of human existence—a state in which the only contest shall be, who shall produce the greatest amount of permanent happiness for the human race. You have all the requisite materials awaiting your proper application of them to effect this change, and circumstances have arisen within the last week[1] to render delay a dereliction of the highest duty which you have to perform to yourselves, to your families, and to the population of the world.

Men of industrious habits, you who are the most honest, useful and valuable portion of society, by producing for it all its wealth and knowledge, you have formed and established the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union of Great Britain and Ireland, and it will prove the palladium of the world. All the intelligent, well-disposed and superior minds among all classes of society, male and female, will now rally round the Consolidated Union and become members of it; and, if the irrationality of the present degraded and degrading system should render it necessary, you will discover the reasons why you should willingly sacrifice all you hold dear in the world, and life itself, rather than submit to its dissolution or slightest depression.

For your sakes I have become a member of your Consolidated Union, and while it shall be directed with the same wisdom and justice that it has been from its commencement, and its proceedings shall be made known to the public as you intend them to be, my resolve is to stand by our order, and support the Union to the utmost of my power. It is this Consolidated Union that alone can save the British empire from greater confusion, anarchy and misery than it has ever yet experienced. It is, it will become daily more and more, the real conservative power of society: for its example will be speedily followed by all nations, and through its beneficial example the greatest revolution ever effected in the history of the human race will be commenced, rapidly carried on and completed all over the world, without bloodshed, violence or evil of any kind, merely by an overwhelming moral influence, which influence individuals and nations will speedily perceive the folly and uselessness of attempting to resist.

Experience has forced these important truths into my mind, and I now give them to the population of the world as the most valuable legacy that man can give to man.

[1] The conviction of the Dorchester Labourers

46 J. E. SMITH: "ON THE PROSPECTS OF SOCIETY." IN THE INSTITUTION, CHARLOTTE STREET, SUNDAY EVENING, MARCH 30

* * * The immediate consequence of any attempt to crush the efforts of the popular mind, at this present juncture, will be a most resolute determination on the part of the people to legislate for themselves.

This will be the result: we shall have a House of Commons. We have never yet had a House of Commons. It is merely a name they have given that aristocratical house at St. Stephen's, which is called the House of the People. The only House of Commons is a House of Trades, and that is only just beginning to be formed. We shall have a new set of boroughs when our unions are organised; every trade shall be a borough, and every trade shall have its council and representatives to conduct its affairs. Our present commoners know nothing of the interests of the people and care not for them. They are all landholders. How can a landholder represent a tradesman?[1] Have the shoemakers a representative in the House of Commons? There are 133,000 shoemakers in the country, and these, with their wives and families, make upwards of half a million of human beings in this country, all living by shoemaking. Yet not one representative have they in the house of legislation; but, according to the proportion which they bear to the population of the country, there ought to be twenty-five representatives of the shoemakers in Parliament. There ought to be nearly as many carpenters, and all other trades in proportion. This would make a literal House of Commons—not a false one, as the present is, which is merely a branch of the House of Lords, and transacts the business of the aristocracy, in the name of the people, without the authority of the people.

* * * * * * * * * *

47 "THE HERALD OF THE RIGHTS OF INDUSTRY"[2] ON AN EIGHT-HOURS DAY, MANCHESTER, SATURDAY, APRIL 5

TO THE MEMBERS OF TRADES UNIONS

* * * We say solemnly and emphatically, STRIKE! not against some handful of greedy and wretched employers, as we have heretofore done, but STRIKE at once against the whole tribe of idlers of every grade, class or condition. It is your labour which enriches them and enables them first to despise and then to oppress you. * * * Come then, friends of the Trades Unions, join the National Regenerators; resolve at once that on the second of June next, you shall work only eight hours a day and for those eight hours insist upon the present amount of wages. You will very soon have a good deal more; but as a beginning insist upon that Do take but this single step and

[1] *i.e.*, a worker.
[2] Organ of the Society for Promoting National Regeneration This article is apropos of the Dorchester convictions.

you are secure for ever. There are no judges to hang, and no soldiers to shoot you for ceasing to work when you are tired.[1]

48 GRAND NATIONAL CONSOLIDATED TRADES UNION PROGRAMME AND MANIFESTO

To the Trades Unions,

[*The failure of the attempts to save the Dorchester labourers, the Derby turn-outs and the general onslaught on Trades Unions constitute a serious menace and it is necessary to evolve a new programme unless the advance of the workers is to be checked.*]

What, in the opinion of this Council, those plans should be, they will now briefly enumerate.

1st, the best means of creating a new market for the productions of useful industry, by enabling the working-classes themselves to be *consumers* of the necessaries, conveniences, and luxuries of life, as well as the *producers* of them.

This can only be done by their forming arrangements to prevent the profits of their toil from going out of the circle of the productive classes into that of the unproductive classes. For this end, each trade society must open shops and offices for dealing with each other, and profitably employing their unemployed. No unionist to lay out his money at any other place but these, for all the articles they can supply.

Provisions being the first thing needful, let the Bakers' Union, in the first instance, open shops where all unionists can be supplied with bread, or have it baked for them. Butchers' shops might be opened upon the same principle; as also gardeners',[2] cheesemongers' and other provision dealers. The tailors and shoemakers and various other Trades Unions, may also open shops for the sale of their articles in the same manner; and it is to be hoped that the Building Trades likewise might soon begin to exercise their calling in a manner much more profitable and gratifying to themselves, and much more beneficially for their order, than they have ever yet been enabled to do.

[*Thereby we should become* capitalists, *as we are always being tauntingly invited by economists to do.*]

2 The next point worthy of our attentive consideration is as to what are the best means of convincing the government that it can no longer keep us in subjection to their tyrannical system of legislating by brute force.

It appears to this Council that something might be done to that end in this way. Let every mechanic, from this time, refuse, under any condition, to manufacture articles known to be for the use of the army or the police; because, in the first place, it is not just nor longer expedient that a few men in power should have the control of these forces, in order to carry things their

[1] Cf: The same paper on April 12:—" Come to eight hours a day instead of twelve, and you strike the ground from under their feet and they must inevitably sink. * * * Strike the blow on the second of June next. Your enemies have been struck by a contemptible enemy [*the 'handful of lordlings' who opposed the Irish Church Bill*] and they cowered at the blow. Strike them thus, formidable—omnipotent as you must then be—and the struggle is over. Your enemies sink before you the moment you all come to eight hours a day."

[2] *i.e.*, greengrocers or market gardeners.

own way against the interests of the many;—Secondly, because their maintenance is a grievous tax upon the wealth-producers and [*one*] which ought not to be endured;—Thirdly, because a standing army is not requisite now to protect us against foreign aggression, as local militias might be substituted for that purpose at very little expense; and fourthly, because they ought not to be maintained for the sake of carrying on wars against other nations, as all such wars are downright inhuman folly, robbery and murder. * * *

As auxiliary to this determination, the Building Trades should in future refuse to build or repair any more barracks, jails, prisons or workhouses; because a good government will do without all such places of abomination.

3 Means must be devised for raising the self-respect of the labouring population, by instituting lectures and schools, mechanics' clubhouses, coffee-houses, etc.; to be under their own sole control.

4 The means must be secured for making the public correctly acquainted with the errors, or rather gross ignorance, of the non-productive classes, by establishing periodicals for that purpose * * *

It is now greatly to be desired that the following five (viz:—the Builders' Union—the Leeds, Bradford and Huddersfield District Union—the Cotton Spinners' Union—the Potters'—and the Clothiers' Union) associated bodies of the Unionists should each elect and send a delegate to represent their interests in the Council now sitting in the metropolis * * *

For the Executive,

London, April 15th, 1834. JOHN BROWNE

1834 April 26: Derby turn-outs broken.

49 R. OWEN: LECTURE ON THE "PIONEER," SUNDAY EVENING, APRIL 27, IN THE CHARLOTTE STREET INSTITUTION

* * * It is time also that the official organ of the Consolidated Union should cease uselessly to irritate other classes of society: this is not the mode to serve any cause, but to create unnecessarily greater obstacles to retard the progress of the sacred cause of human amelioration, undertaken by the National Consolidated Union. No man, who understands what human nature really is, and how in each individual, it is formed to become what we find it at maturity, and who comprehends the elements of which all society is formed, and how they must be combined to produce any permanent good for the mass of the people, can continue to write to irritate, and not apply sound argument in a right spirit to convince that what is erroneous, founded upon false data, which must, as experience has proved, lead to the most complicated evils in practice, and that [*sic*] the adoption now of principles derived from plain general facts, of the truth of which no one can doubt, would soon lead to the removal of those evils, and introduce a state of society far superior to any which has ever been experienced by any portion of the human race.

Let, therefore, reason and sound argument, and not passion and prejudice,

or party or petty proceedings of any kind, be now the characteristic of the official and public organ of the Consolidated Union. Not an article should be in it which ought not to be calmly considered by the Executive and marked as having received their deliberate sanction * * *

1834 April 30: London Tailors' Strike.

50 MAY 3: LEADER IN THE "CRISIS"

STRIKES after strikes in thick succession rise. Last week our attention was engaged by a formidable strike at Oldham, and by the termination of the long-continued determined strike of Derby, whose fatal issue might almost have deterred the working classes from ever after engaging in such unequal contests with their employers, before their Union was sufficiently complete to have a long strike, and a strong strike, and a strike all together. The evil of all these engagements is that they are partial; they are merely skirmishes which may for a season annoy the enemy, but never can accomplish anything conclusive for the benefit of industry at large * * *

We are still continuing to act upon the destructive system. We are battering and breaking down, but we are not constructing. We are merely a band of foragers and marauders. We are sadly annoying and alarming all the peaceable inhabitants of the land; but we have not sufficient unity of action to take possession of the country or govern it when taken. We have neither a personal leader, nor a principle to lead us; and one lodge, one trade, is concerting plans for its own advancement, upon which it acts, without the co-operation of the other lodges or unions of the country * * *

There are three kinds of power, the power of wealth, of talents, and of numbers. Have these partial strikers provided themselves with either of these powers? Have they more wealth than their masters, more talents or more numerical power than the unstruck labourer? Certainly not; and the consequence must be that, for want of power, they must yield the victory, and chew the cud over a total discomfiture. By a general union they might provide themselves with every species of power; and by a general strike they might bring their superiors to any terms of accommodation. But these petty strivings are like petty thefts, which may, by some jesuitical casuistry, be justified upon the principle of equality, but are, notwithstanding, injurious to the peace of society, and held in abhorrence by every virtuous man * * *

51 THE "DOCUMENT," AS PRESENTED BY THE LONDON MASTER TAILORS, MAY 23, 1834

WE, the undersigned, foremen, journeymen tailors and others, now in the employment of ....., do voluntarily declare that we are not members of the Trades Union; that it is not our intention to become members of any such association; nor do we now, nor will we in any way, directly or indirectly, contribute towards the support of any such association. In attestation of which we hereunto subscribe our names this ..... day of ....., 1834.

1834 June: Morrison leaves the Executive.
1834 June 14: The Leeds, etc., Union, after a week's strike, collapses.
1834 July 5: Last number of the *Pioneer*.
1834 July 19: Beer dispute at Messrs. Cubitt's leads to London building lock-out.
1834 August 20: Grand National Consolidated Trades Union becomes the British and Foreign Association.
1834 August 23: Last number of the *Crisis*.

Section II

England, 1837-1854. *Chartism*

52 *Bronterre's National Reformer*, No. 1. Statement of Aims, January 7 1837
53 London Working-men's Association, Petition of February 18 1837
54 P. Bussey: Speech on Arming, October 15 1838
55 Feargus O'Connor: Speech on Physical Force, November 6 1838
56 Rev. J. R. Stephens: *The Political Preacher*, January 6 1839
57 J. C. Coombe: "What is the Object of the Charter?" April 27 1839
58 The Eight Questions of the Convention, May 13 1839
59 Insurrectionary Leaflet of May 23 1839
60 Convention's Resolutions on the Birmingham Riot, July 4 1839
61 The First National Petition, July 12 1839
62 Extracts from the Second National Petition, May 2 1842
63A and B Resolution and Placard Calling the General Strike, August 12 1842
64 Feargus O'Connor on Communism 1847
65 Resolutions of the Convention, April 5 1848
66 Ernest Jones: *Song of the Lower Classes* 1854

Introduction

IN order to comprehend the Chartist movement it is essential to have a clear idea of the economic condition of the working classes both before and during this period. Adequate information can be found elsewhere,[1] but in order to understand the existence and character of Chartism, it is essential that the reader should have ever present in his mind a vivid idea of the terrible sufferings which were in those days the common lot of the working-men. The long hours, the employment of women and children, the starvation wages, the foul housing and total want of education gave to Chartism its spasmodic character, its incoherence and final helplessness. The strength of the middle class and the consequent degradation of the workers made any serious attack doomed to failure, the very bitterness of the workers' sufferings made inevitable outbreaks which were at once violent and pitiable. From the close of the Napoleonic wars until about the middle fifties the revolt on the part of the workers is continual; it is only its form that varies. Orator Hunt, Robert Owen, Feargus O'Connor, represent only three stages of the same movement.

It was not until after 1834—after, that is to say, the final collapse of the "Grand National"—that the way was clear for another working-class movement. Industrial action having failed them, it was natural that the working class should turn again to political action. Indeed, the history of the English working class reminds one of a helpless prisoner, knocking uselessly at one door, turning to the other, returning again to the first, and all in vain. The alternations of political Radicalism, industrial Owenism, political Chartism, "Old" Trade Unionism, etc., succeed each other monotonously, and by neither door can the workers find an exit from their prison.

In 1836, then, the year of the foundation of the London Working-men's Association, the way was clear for a new movement. The workers were politically under the influence of two sections, the extreme Radicals and the Young Tories, both of which were caught up into the Chartist movement. The latter, the section of the Tory Party which was best represented in Parliament by Michael Sadler, was occupied in a furious campaign against the crying evils of the factory system, and more particularly against the ferocious "New Poor Law" of 1834. This Act had two avowed objects. The first was to prevent the poor having more children than, according to Malthus, they should have; it was on this ground denounced as irreligious. Secondly, it aimed at making Poor Relief obtainable only under such difficult and harsh conditions that no one should have recourse to it except in the last extremity; it was therefore justly denounced as inhuman. Engels describes its operation thus[2]:

[1] For most people it is enough to read J. L. and B. Hammond: *The Town Labourer* (up till 1832) and els: *Condition of the English Working Class in* 1844.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 287.

"All relief in money and provisions was abolished: the only relief allowed was admission to the workhouses immediately built. The regulations for these workhouses, or, as people call them, Poor Law Bastiles, is such as to frighten away everyone who has the slightest prospect in life without this form of public charity. To make sure that relief be applied for only in the most extreme cases, and after every other effort had failed, the workhouse has been made the most repulsive residence which the refined ingenuity of a Malthusian can invent. The food is worse than that of the most ill-paid working-man, while employed, and the work harder, or they might prefer the workhouse to their wretched existence outside. Meat, especially fresh meat, is rarely furnished, chiefly potatoes, the worst possible bread and oatmeal porridge, little or no beer. The food of criminal prisoners is better, as a rule, so that the paupers frequently commit some offence for the purpose of getting into jail. For the workhouse is a jail, too; he who does not finish his task gets nothing to eat; he who wishes to go out must ask permission, which is granted or not, according to his behaviour or the inspector's whim; tobacco is forbidden, also the receipt of gifts from relatives or friends outside the house; the paupers wear a workhouse uniform, and are handed over helpless and without redress, to the caprice of the inspectors. To prevent their labour from competing with that of outside concerns, they are set to rather useless tasks: the men break stones, 'as much as the strong man can accomplish with effort in a day'; the women, children and aged men pick oakum, for I know not what insignificant use. To prevent the 'superfluous' from multiplying, and, 'demoralised' parents from influencing their children, families are broken up; the husband is placed in one wing, the wife in another, the children in a third, and they are permitted to see one another only at stated times after long intervals, and then only when they have, in the opinion of the officials, behaved well. And in order to shut off the external world from contamination by pauperism within these bastiles, the inmates are permitted to receive visits only with the consent of the officials, and in the reception-rooms; to communicate in general with the world outside only by leave and under supervision.

" * * * In the St. Pancras workhouse in London an epileptic died of suffocation during an attack in bed, no one coming to his relief; in the same house four to six, sometimes eight children, slept in one bed. In Shoreditch workhouse a man was placed, together with a fever patient violently ill, in a bed teeming with vermin. In Bethnal Green workhouse, London, a woman in the sixth month of pregnancy was shut up in the reception-room with her two-year-old child from February 28 to March 20, without the trace of a bed or the means of satisfying her most natural wants."

Richard Oastler and the Reverend Joseph Rayner Stephens (see No. 56) were the most popular and influential men of this group, and though they avoided the name "Chartist," they commonly worked with O'Connor and his followers, while their adherents were swept into the movement *en masse*. It was, however, from the Radicals that the Charter itself emanated. The

whole of England was dotted with Radical Associations, deeply disappointed with the Reform Bill of 1832, which had only enfranchised the middle classes, and prepared to demand a larger measure of political reform. One of these, the London Working-men's Association, drafted in 1837 the Petition (No. 53) containing the Six Points which afterwards formed the Charter. The Six Points, as will be seen, seem to us not in the least revolutionary. They are: Equal electoral districts, universal male[1] suffrage, annual Parliaments, no property qualification for M.P.s, vote by ballot, and payment of members. This programme, drafted into the form of a Bill, became the famous Charter; and was eagerly taken up by the Radical Associations, including the Birmingham Political Union, which had taken a considerable part in forcing the passage of the Reform Bill. The formal constitution of the Chartist movement may be dated from a meeting at Newhall Hill on August 6, 1838.

It has frequently been observed that practically all the demands of the Chartists have been obtained without a serious upheaval and without making any revolutionary change in the condition of England. To deduce from this that the Chartists were merely "Liberal working-men" is entirely unjust. A certain section, led by Lovett, who was under the influence of Francis Place, no doubt believed that the Points of the Charter contained the ultimate aims of the movement. The Radical Associations also generally held this movement to be merely a continuation of the old Reform agitation, and modelled their actions upon their predecessors'. They provided the backbone of the section which became known as "moral force Chartists." They shared, however, with their rivals, the new and bitter feeling which gave Chartism its distinctive character—class-consciousness. In Lovett's Petition (No. 53) we can observe in the preamble a consciousness of oppression *by the middle class*, which had hitherto been commonly regarded as the ally of the workers in the conquest of political liberty. Still more is this true of the other section, which was of far greater importance in the Chartist ranks. So far from being content with the programme of the Charter, most Chartists supported it merely as the necessary preliminary to social equality, as O'Brien plainly states (Document 52).[2] Illuminating, in this connection, is Thomas Cooper's account of his conversion to Chartism.[3] He had been sent to report, for the first time, a Chartist meeting in Leicester. He listened to speeches which seemed to him merely moderate and reasonable. When he came out, he was "surprised to see the long upper windows of the meaner houses fully lighted, and to hear the loud creak of the stocking-frame." He asked a man by him whether it was usual to work so late. They answered that it was not, but that they were glad enough to do so when they could get enough work, which was rare. In answer to another question, he was told that their wages, when fully employed, averaged "four and sixpence." "Four and sixpence," he

[1] Female suffrage was abandoned as in advance of the age, but Lovett and W. J. Linton advocated it, while in 1842, the hey-day of Chartism, there were signs of the beginning of a regular movement. See Slosson, *op. cit.*, p. 206.

[2] Even clearer is Coombe's statement (No. 57) in Harney's *London Democrat*. And it is well known that J. R. Stephens described the Charter as a "knife and fork question."

[3] *Life*, p. 138.

answered, "*** that's twenty-seven shillings a week." "What are you talking about?" said they; "you mean four and sixpence a day; but we mean four and sixpence a week." Most people, on such a discovery, would nowadays seek to get up an agitation to raise stockingers' wages, to extend the Trades Boards Act, perhaps; Cooper became a Chartist. Similar feelings impelled most of the Chartists. We find a growing note of class resentment in their Petitions (Nos. 61 and 62); at the time of the general strike, for example, (p. 132) the growth of the evil is openly referred to "class legislation," and the whole spirit of the movement is truly summed up in Ernest Jones's fine poem *The Song of the Lower Classes* (No. 66). This school, whose demand was primarily economic, gave recruits to the Physical Force men, who felt instinctively that the middle classes could not be persuaded to consent peaceably to the overthrow of their domination. Some, like the great Feargus O'Connor, though approving in theory, never decided in fact to use force.[1] Unfortunately, class-consciousness was as far as the Chartists went. Of what they would do when the Charter was won they had little or no idea. Feargus O'Connor floated a scheme for small holdings, and declared himself opposed to Communism.[2] O'Brien, on the other hand, was a follower of Babeuf, and adopted his ideas in their entirety. Lovett produced a wild-cat scheme for endowing Chartist schools. Scattered among the Chartists were many followers of Robert Owen, who were then the only party known as Socialists.[3] And so on. The published programme of the Chartists did not correspond to their real desires; nor had they any other accepted proposals in reserve.

The direct economic basis of Chartism is further shown by the character of their supporters. The Chartist stalwarts were drawn chiefly from the stockingers, handloom weavers and miners. The respectable skilled workers of the London Working-men's Association were swiftly outnumbered by the hordes of famished and miserable workers in the North, and these latter gave the movement its characteristic personnel. It is noticeable, therefore, that these trades were exactly those in which the workers suffered the worst. We have already read Cooper's account of the stockingers; the situation of the handloom weavers, forced to compete by hand with machinery not unlike machinery as we know it to-day, hardly needs description. The wages of the miners were not so incredibly low, but their sufferings were, if anything, even worse. Men, women and children worked almost—if not entirely—naked at difficult and exhausting work for unlimited hours, in daily danger of their lives, and if they did not die by an accident, death by disease was their certain fate.

Again, this economic basis, combined with the lack of a proper programme, gave to Chartism its curiously spasmodic character. It acts as an exact barometer of industrial conditions. We shall find that its three "high tides," which

[1] O'Connor's position is given by his speech on p. 119. Bussey (No. 54), and the leaflet on p. 125 will serve to indicate the extremer standpoint.

[2] No. 64. Much later, Ernest Jones accepted Marx's programme, but the movement was already dying.

[3] Frequently, however, they are to be found in opposition. See Thomas Cooper: *Life*, p. 174.

correspond roughly with the three Petitions (1839, 1842, 1848) occur directly after severe economic crises.

Among those who were swept up into the new movement was a democratic orator of the North, Feargus O'Connor, once member for Cork. In him were concentrated some of the most remarkable characteristics of the Chartist movement. He was typical in his extreme impulsiveness, his lack of any thought-out programme of social reform, his untiring and noisy energy, and his fierce invective and extreme suspicion. Wherever he went he made enemies, yet at the same time he added innumerable recruits to the Chartist cause. His splendid eloquence, his devotion and his personal magnetism gave him an amazing sway over his followers. Yet his very impulsiveness made it impossible for him to remain really consistent as a politician; his violent language, vanity and intolerance of an equal caused many quarrels with other Chartist leaders, and, in the last days of his leadership, his inconsequence and violence grew. He was, however, by that time probably insane.[1]

The meeting at Newhall Hill, already mentioned, marked the beginning of the change in the Chartist, the transference of power from Lovett to O'Connor. O'Connor, an inspired demagogue, appealed, as he said, to the unshaven chins, blistered hands, and fustian jackets. The control was wrested from the hands of the skilled London artisans by the miserable proletariat of the North. "Moral force men" began to yield to "physical force men," reformists to revolutionaries. What on the surface appears to be a personal quarrel between Lovett and O'Connor is in reality a struggle between the upper and lower strata of the working-class.

The first crisis of Chartism came suddenly. The agitation was inaugurated during the severe economic crisis of 1838, which was inflicting the greatest suffering on the workers. The new movement spread like wildfire, and with it the spirit of revolution. In October a Convention—a menacing name!—was elected, which met in February and decided to present the document known as the First Petition (No. 61). The Moral Force men still held sway, but the Physical Force men were very much in evidence. The preparations they had made for armed revolt reduced the middle classes to a condition of craven fear. General Napier, in his *Life and Opinions* (vol. ii), gives a vivid picture of the distracted and terrified local authorities, and the contempt which they inspired in him is very instructive.[2] It is, however, certain that the outbreak of an attempt at revolution was perilously near.

While awaiting the result of the petition, which had 1,280,000 signatures, the Convention had to consider its future policy, if the petition was rejected. The split between the moral and physical force Chartists became more obvious every day, and was intensified by the personal quarrel between Lovett and O'Connor. Eventually they agreed to submit to their constituents the proposals contained in No. 58, which not only shows the economic character of the movement, but proves also that their leaders had considerable tactical

[1] All the accounts of O'Connor are written by his personal enemies and this has prejudiced history against him.

[2] Parodying Barère's "Terror is the order of the day," he writes "*Funk* is the order of the day."

ability. Meanwhile, as the feeling in the Chartist ranks had been exasperated by a bloody riot in Birmingham, Lovett, largely to avoid worse consequences, made himself a scapegoat by signing the proclamation given on p. 125. He was arrested and imprisoned, and while the loss of so able a leader unjustifiably depressed the majority of the Convention, it left the way clear for violent action by the minority when the Petition was rejected, as it was on July 12. The Convention decided first to call a general strike—a "sacred month"—and then, judging rightly that the lack of organisation and the extreme poverty and unemployment made it impracticable, ignominiously withdrew its motion. The Welsh colliers, apparently spontaneously, decided to take the action that it would not. Armed bands gathered in the hills of Monmouthshire and descended in growing numbers upon the town of Newport on November 4. They proposed to take this by force and proceed to Cardiff, by which time their victory would have been the signal for general risings in the country. They advanced as far as the Westgate Hotel in Newport, where they were met by a violent fire from the troops concealed therein. They were unable to make any effective reply, were scattered and had no time to re-form.[1] John Frost, their leader, and others were arrested and the other risings, naturally, did not occur. This sanguinary failure broke the strength of Chartism among the colliers, who never again took an active part in the movement. Frost, Williams and Jones were transported.

The Chartist movement at once fell into a rapid decline. In 1840, in addition to those mentioned, no fewer than ten of the most indispensable leaders were in prison—Richardson, O'Brien, Judson, Henry Vincent, Holberry, O'Connor, Carrier, Roberts, Williams and Binns. This, and the Welsh failure, were not the only reasons of the decline; much must be allowed for the recovery of trade from the 1838 crisis and the consequent decrease of unemployment. Want and hunger were always the chief recruiting sergeants of the Chartist army.

On his release in August, 1841, O'Connor flung himself into the work of reviving the movement. By means of his powerful organ, *The Northern Star*, and by organising the National Charter Association, he provided the movement with a coherence and vitality that it had never had before. On the other hand, he quarrelled finally with the moderate section: Lovett founded a counter Association, which was willing to co-operate with the middle classes and abandon opposition to the Anti-Corn Law League. O'Brien associated himself with the manufacturer Joseph Sturge's Complete Suffrage Association. Both virtually thus fell out of the Chartist ranks, leaving O'Connor without a serious rival.[2]

At the beginning of 1842, severe economic suffering brought more strength into the Chartist ranks and stung them into vigorous action. The crisis of that year caused especial hardship to the workers in the North: Leeds Poor

[1] See an anonymous hostile work: *The Rise and Fall of Chartism in Monmouthshire.*

[2] The Chartist opposition to the Anti-Corn Law League, as an orator explained at Cooper's meeting (above, p. 106), did not proceed from a belief that the laws were good; but they refused to support a middle-class agitation again. When they had their Charter, they would repeal the Corn Laws and all other bad laws, but they must not be side-tracked and should remember that without votes they would always remain slaves.

Law Guardians, for example, had in hand £10,000 before its beginning and borrowed another £7,000, yet all was gone before the end of the crisis. And a man must be wretched indeed before he applied to the Poor Law. It was then that was seen the effects of O'Connor's organisation. Although the second petition (No. 62) was presented as early as May 2, it had no fewer than 3,315,752 signatures. Events had moved so quickly that there was no Convention or similar body sitting, nor was the Executive of the Charter Association prepared to take any decided action when the petition was rejected. The "trades delegates"—Trade Unions were just beginning to revive—in Manchester took the matter into their own hands (No. 63). A strike on a matter of wages, which began in Ashton-under-Lyne, was turned by them into a general strike for the Charter in the North of England.[1] The mills were stopped over nearly all Lancashire, and men went from town to town closing them and knocking the boiler-plugs out so as to make work impossible. The Charter Association gave them official support, but undoubtedly the strike, although it lasted into September, was doomed to failure. The handloom workers could not strike with any effect; while unemployment was rife a strike lost most of its terrors for the governing classes, and in some cases, at least, employers who were faced with financial ruin owing to the crisis were not sorry to have their mills forcibly closed down and their commercial reputation saved. In any case, the collapse of the strike was hastened by the use of the military.

This failure, and the inevitable return of prosperity, dealt Chartism a mortal blow. It never recovered its tremendous proportions, although it had another revival before it died. In the years between 1842 and 1847 the movement was almost moribund, and O'Connor was occupied in a worthless land scheme. He floated, by Chartist subscriptions, a National Land Company, which was to settle poor Chartists on small-holdings. He believed that by the profits he would be able eventually to change England into a country of peasant proprietors. The colonies he founded, naturally, did not prosper, as weavers from the slums could hardly be expected to make successful small farmers, and the Company went bankrupt in 1848. He lost much in money by this failure and more in reputation.

The Irish famine of 1845-6, and commercial crisis of the latter year, gave a little life to the moribund Chartist movement. The agitation revived, and in 1847 reached its height, when O'Connor was elected for Nottingham.[2] The movement was already declining again, when in 1848, the news of the French Revolution spurred the Chartists to fresh action. The revival was essentially artificial, in spite of the riots which occurred over all England during March and April, 1848. Nevertheless, the Chartists were entirely deceived by these movements. A fresh Convention was called, which was to present a last petition; when this was rejected, a "National Assembly" was to be called, which, according to the secret hopes of many Chartists, would lead

[1] It was said at the time that some employers were supporting the strike in the hope that it would become a Free Trade demonstration. If there were such employers, they were few in number.
[2] Of course, the voters were all of the middle-class.

an armed revolt. The wildest hopes were entertained concerning the new petition: O'Connor and his lieutenant, Ernest Jones, spoke of five, and even six, million signatures. The petition was to be presented by an immense procession to the House of Commons on April 10, and some, no doubt, looked forward to that day as the signal for the outbreak of the Revolution. The authorities were deeply apprehensive, and London was packed with troops to prevent the holding of the procession. On the day itself, a small and indifferent crowd assembled to hear O'Connor; the procession was abandoned, and the petition conveyed ignominiously to the House in a hansom cab. Still more depressing was the downfall when the Committee which examined the petition reported that it had only 1,975,496 signatures, including those of "distinguished persons who cannot be supposed to have concurred in its prayer," such as Sir Robert Peel, "Victoria Rex, 1st April," the Duke of Wellington—who had, apparently, signed seventeen times!—Prince Albert, etc., also such other names as "Mr. Punch," "Pugnose," "Flatnose," "No Cheese," which were subject to justifiable suspicion. This, together with the final failure of the Land Company, made Chartism appear excessively ridiculous, and it never recovered. Attempts at arming and drilling by the extremists were easily suppressed. O'Connor was by now practically insane, and in 1852 had to be confined in an asylum; and though Ernest Jones made attempts to carry on the movement up till 1858, the whole strength of Chartism completely disappeared; nor did any other political movement arise to take its place.

The collapse of April 10, however, is not, as is often assumed, enough to account for this. It is necessary to give a brief account of the deeper reasons. The main cause, was, no doubt, that the passing of the Factory Acts, and particularly the institution of a regular corps of inspectors, removed the worst grievances of the Chartists, and supplied, as far as is possible under the capitalist system, a remedy for their worst sufferings. This alleviation was also accentuated by the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846, which led to a quick and permanent fall in the price of food, not entirely counteracted by the 10 per cent. reduction in wages with which the Liberal manufacturers celebrated their victory. Generally, the standard of living of the working classes began to go up after 1842. In a useful table given by Mr. Slosson[1] he calculates that if wages and food prices in the years 1837-41 are reckoned at 100, the index numbers for 1852 are *Wages:* 100 and *Food Prices:* 77. For various reasons the prosperity of the middle classes in England continued to expand for many years, and the working class received some small share of their benefits. Equally important is the growth of Trade Unions, on a strictly craft basis, among the skilled workers. The re-growth of Unions had begun in 1842, but was checked by the fall of the National Association of United Trades in 1845. They revived quickly after the crisis of 1847, and in 1853 the cotton trades assumed their present form of organisation. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers was formed in 1850, and there were few trades which did not

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 137.

make an attempt to imitate the phenomenal success of the new organisation during the next few years. The same class of workers as were affected by the Trade Union movement also benefited by the growth of co-operation. This meant that large sections of the working class had obtained for themselves a perilous niche of security in the economic struggle, and were very disinclined to join in any revolutionary movement which would destroy at once the fragile protection they had built up with such difficulty.

Certain sections of the workers were, of course, not affected by these alleviations. They did not touch the stockingers and handloom weavers. No doubt, such of these as did not find employment as general labourers, died the death assigned to them by Professors of Political Economy: exhaustion and death account for the failure of Chartist recruits from this source. But henceforward the use of machinery spread more regularly and gradually, and there was no violent expulsion of workers. No masses of handworkers were again suddenly thrown out in great waves to starve upon the streets, and provide material for such convulsive movements as the Chartist. British labour entered upon a long period of comparative material comfort and extreme intellectual stagnation.

Bibliographical Note

Of secondary sources for the history of Chartism there are very few. The only good history is the late Mr. Mark Hovell's *The Chartist Movement* (Longmans, Green and Co.), but it is only half finished, and the ending added by Prof. Tout is most inadequate. The long and able account in Max Beer's *History of British Socialism* (II, Part I) is essential, and I regret that I did not have the use of it in writing this. There exists also a contemporary history, R. G. Gammage's *History of the Chartist Movement*, but it is a mere chronicle, lacking all sense of proportion. Columbia College, N.Y., has issued three useful monographs, viz., P. W. Slosson, *Decline of the Chartist Movement*; F. Rosenblatt, *The Chartist Movement*; H. U. Faulkner, *Chartism and the Churches*.

Of primary sources, there deserve to be mentioned: Wm. Lovett *Life and Struggles* (recently reissued by Messrs. Bell), the *Life of Thomas Cooper, by Himself*, the *Place MSS.* in the British Museum, General Napier's *Life and Opinions of Sir C. J. Napier* (Vol. II), the trials of distinguished Chartists in the *State Trials*, and the files of the *Northern Star*, the *Labourer*, etc.[1]

It is essential to read for the economic background Engels' *Condition of the English Working Class in* 1844.

[1] Gammage gives a list of Chartist periodicals.

Documents

1834 The New Poor Law.
1836 London Working Men's Association founded.

52 "BRONTERRE'S NATIONAL REFORMER," No. 1, JANUARY 7: STATEMENT OF AIMS[1]

* * * For the rest, I will only observe that the end I have in view is—

Social equality for each and all,

to obtain this we must first have—

Political equality for each and all.

To obtain political equality, we must have a more extensive and effective organisation of the working classes, and of that portion of the middle class which is immediately dependent on their custom, than has hitherto been even thought of, much less accomplished It will, therefore, be an object of mine to promote such

Extensive and effective organisation,

and as the best means of promoting it, I will never cease to recommend and encourage among these classes

Knowledge and union,

a full and accurate knowledge of their wrongs and of their rights; and a steady union of purpose to redress the one and obtain permanent enjoyment of the other.

1837 Quarrel between Wm. Lovett and F. O'Connor.

53 LONDON WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION: PETITION, FEBRUARY 18

TO THE HON. THE COMMONS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

The Petition of the undersigned members of the Working Men's Association and others,

Sheweth,

That the only *rational use* of the institutions and laws of society is justly to protect, encourage and support all that can be made to contribute to *the happiness of all the people.*

That as the object to be attained is mutual benefit, so ought the enactment of laws to be by mutual consent.

That obedience to the law can only be *justly enforced* on the certainty that those who are called on to obey them have had, either personally or by their representatives, a power to enact, amend or repeal them.

That all those who are excluded from this share of political power are not justly included within the operation of the laws. To them the laws are only

[1] *Bronterre's National Reformer in Government, Law, Property, Religion and Morals.* (Edited by James Bronterre O'Brien, A.B.). Price One Penny. For his views see also Nos. 24–27 of the French Revolution. Bronterre O'Brien translated these documents as an appendix to Buonarroti's *History of Babeuf's Conspiracy.* He says (p. xiii): ' Buonarroti's book contains one of the best expositions I have seen of those great political and social principles which I have so long advocated."

despotic enactments, and the legislative assembly from whom they emanate can only be considered as parties to an unholy compact, devising plans and schemes for taxing and subjecting the many.

That the universal political right of every human being is superior and stands apart from all customs, forms, or ancient usage; a fundamental right not in the power of man to confer, or justly to deprive him of.

That to take away this sacred right from the *person* and vest it in the *property*, is a wilful perversion of justice and common sense, as the creation and security of property *are the consequences of society*—the great object of which is human happiness.

That any constitution or code of laws formed in violation of men's political and social rights, are not rendered sacred by time nor sanctified by custom. That the ignorance which originated or permits their operation forms no excuse for perpetuating the injustice; nor can aught but force or fraud sustain them when any considerable number of the people perceive and feel their degradation.

That the intent and object of your Petitioners are to present such facts before your Hon. House, as will serve to convince you and the country at large that you do not represent the people of these realms; and to appeal to your sense of right and justice as well as every principle of honour, for directly making such legislative enactments as shall cause the mass of the people to be represented *with the view of securing the greatest amount of happiness to all classes of society.*

Your Petitioners find, by returns ordered by your Hon. House, that the whole people of Great Britain and Ireland are about 24 millions, and that the males above 21 years of age are 6,023,752, who, in the opinion of your Petitioners are justly entitled to the elective right.

That according to S. Wortley's return (ordered by your Hon. House), the number of registered electors who have the power to vote for members of Parliament are only 839,519, and of this number only 8½ in 12 give their votes.

That on an analysis of the constituency of the United Kingdom, your Petitioners find that 331 members (being a *majority* of your Hon. House) *are returned by one hundred and fifty-one thousand four hundred and ninety-two registered electors.* That comparing the whole of the male population above the age of 21 with the 151,492 electors, it appears that 1/40th of them, or 1/160th of the entire population, have the power of passing all the laws in your Hon. House.

And your Petitioners further find on investigation, that this majority of 331 members are composed of 163 Tories or Conservatives, 134 Whigs and Liberals, and only 34 who call themselves Radicals; and out of this limited number it is questionable whether 10 can be found who are truly the representatives of the wants and wishes of the producing classes.

Your Petitioners also find that 15 members of your Hon. House are returned by electors under 200, 55 under 300, 99 under 400, 121 under 500,

159 under 600, 196 under 700, 214 under 800, 240 under 900, and 250 under 1,000; and that many of these constituencies are divided between two members.

They also find that your Hon. House, which is said to be exclusively the people's or the Commons' House, *contains two hundred and five persons who are immediately or remotely related to the peers of the realm.*

Also that your Hon. House contains 1 marquess, 7 earls, 19 viscounts, 32 lords, 25 right honourables, 52 honourables, 63 baronets, 13 knights, 3 admirals, 7 lord-lieutenants, 42 deputy and vice-lieutenants, 1 general, 5 lieutenant-generals, 9 major-generals, 32 colonels, 33 lieutenant-colonels, 16 majors, 49 captains in army and navy, 10 lieutenants, 2 cornets, 58 barristers, 3 solicitors, 40 bankers, 33 East India proprietors and 13 West India proprietors, 52 placemen, 114 patrons of church livings having the patronage of 272 livings between them; the names of whom your Petitioners can furnish at the request of your Hon. House.

Your Petitioners therefore respectfully submit to your Hon. House that these facts afford abundant proofs that you do not represent the numbers or the interests of the millions, but that the persons composing it have interests for the most part foreign or directly opposed to the true interests of the great body of the people.

That perceiving the tremendous power you possess over the lives, liberty and labour of the unrepresented millions—perceiving the *military* and *civil forces* at your command—the *revenue* at your disposal—the *relief of the poor* in your hands—the *public press* in your power by enactments *expressly excluding the working classes alone*—moreover; the power of delegating to others the whole control of the *monetary* arrangements of the kingdom, by which the labouring classes may be silently plundered or suddenly suspended from employment—seeing all these elements of power wielded by your Hon. House *as at present constituted*, and fearing the consequences that may result if a thorough reform is not speedily had recourse to, your Petitioners earnestly pray your Hon. House TO ENACT THE FOLLOWING AS THE LAW OF THESE REALMS, with such other essential details as your Hon. House may deem necessary:—

A LAW FOR EQUALLY REPRESENTING THE PEOPLE OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Equal Representation.

That the United Kingdom be divided into 200 electoral districts, dividing as nearly as possible an equal number of inhabitants; and that each district do send a representative to Parliament

Universal Suffrage.

That every person producing proofs of his being 21 years of age to the clerk of the parish in which he has resided six months shall be entitled to have his name registered as a voter, that the time for registering in each year be from 1st of January to 1st of March.

Annual Parliaments.

That a general election do take place on the 24th of June in each year, and that each vacancy be filled up a fortnight after it occurs. That the hours for voting be from six o'clock in the morning till six o'clock in the evening.

No Property Qualifications.

That there shall be no property qualification for Members; but on a requisition signed by 200 voters, in favour of any candidate, being presented to the clerk of the parish in which they reside, such candidate shall be put in nomination. And a list of all candidates nominated throughout the district shall be stuck on the church door in every parish, to enable voters to judge of their qualification.

Vote by Ballot.

That each voter must vote in the parish in which he resides. That each parish provide as many balloting boxes as there are candidates proposed in the district; and that a temporary place be fitted up in each parish church for the purpose of secret voting. And on the day of election, as each voter passes orderly on to the ballot, he shall have given to him by the officer in attendance a balloting ball, which he shall drop into the box of his favourite candidate. At the close of the day the votes shall be counted by the proper officers, and the numbers stuck on the church doors. The following day the clerk of the district and two examiners shall collect the votes of all the parishes throughout the district, and cause the name of the successful candidate to be posted in every parish of the district.

Sittings and Payments to Members.

That the members do take their seats in Parliament on the first Monday in October, next after their election, and continue their sittings every day (Sundays excepted) till the business of the sitting is terminated, but not later than the 1st of September. They shall meet every day (during the session) for business at ten o'clock in the morning, and adjourn at four. And every Member shall be paid (quarterly) out of the public treasury 400*l.* a year.

That all electoral officers be elected by universal suffrage.

By passing the foregoing as the law of the land, you will confer a great blessing on the people of England, and our Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

[The Notice convening the meeting which passed this has as heading:— TO WORKING MEN. A PUBLIC MEETING *convened by the* WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION, *will be held in the Large Room of the* CROWN AND ANCHOR TAVERN, Strand, on TUESDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 28th AT SEVEN O'CLOCK PRECISELY, *For the Purpose of Petitioning Parliament* for UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE, NO PROPERTY QUALIFICATION, ANNUAL PARLIAMENTS, EQUAL REPRESENTATION, PAYMENT OF MEMBERS, AND VOTE BY BALLOT. ROBERT HARTWELL in the Chair. By order of the Committee. W. LOVETT, *Secretary*.

On the copy preserved in the British Museum is written in Lovett's handwriting "The Prayer of this Petition was the origin of the People's Charter. —W. L."]

1838 May 8: The CHARTER[1] published.
1838 August 6: Constitution of Chartist movement at Newhall Hill.
1838 October 15: Great meeting at Hartshead Moor.

54 P. BUSSEY: SPEECH ON ARMING

EXTRACT FROM THE PROCEEDINGS AT HARTSHEAD MOOR.[2]

MR. PETER BUSSEY, of Bradford, speaking in support of the first resolution[3] said:—

Mr. Chairman and Working Men of the West Riding of York,—I am glad to meet you to-day. It matters not what a Whig press or a Tory press may say of our meeting together[4]. I tell you that you have made a display of[5] a moral and physical force that neither faction can beat.[6] (*Cheers.*)

In reading history we find a time when the men of Yorkshire and Lancashire deluged the plains of the two counties with their blood, and for what purpose? Why, to know[7] which should be the general[8] puppet of the nation and live in splendour on our toil and produce.[9] We are not met for any such purpose to-day. Lincolnshire[10] has had its meeting, to-day Yorkshire[11] has met to form a holy and indissoluble union against tyrants and to gain freedom[12] or to die in our present condition. Mr. Baines, the proprietor of the *Leeds Poison*[13] (I would wish his reporter to take every word down) in his last week's paper finds out two important truths. One is that Universal Suffrage would destroy the monarchy. Mark that, reporters. (*Cheers.*) The second is that neither the poor man nor the rich man have any natural rights to the elective franchise. (*Laughter.*) Now, my friends, let me tell you, that if there is no such thing as a natural right to the franchise, that right must have been conceded to the party moving[14] in power, or it must have been acquired by fraud,[15] deceit, cunning, sophistry and[16] by some damnable trick they must have[17] cheated you out of it: because, let me tell you that Baines

[1] Being in form a Parliamentary Bill, it is too long for insertion. Its " six points" are given above, and these and the first National Petition give a proper idea of its contents.
[2] From the *Northern Star Extraordinary*, October 16. The Place MSS. (Add. MSS. 27,820) gives a different text and omits large sections.
[3] " That this meeting is of opinion that the cause of all the corruptions and anomalies in legislation, as well as the difficulties of the commercial, manufacturing, trading and working classes, is, that our representative system is based upon exclusive and unjust privileges and we therefore believe that the time has arrived for establishing that system upon a foundation more in accordance with principles of justice, brotherly love and the universal knowledge of the people."
[4] MSS. Omit " Mr. * * * together."
[5] MSS. " Marshalled."
[6] " That can beat either or both the factions, Whig and Tory " (MSS.)
[7] " Decide " (MSS.).
[8] " Greatest " (MSS.).
[9] " On the toil of the people " (MSS.).
[10] Error for " Lancashire " (as MSS.).
[11] " The western portion of Yorkshire " (MSS.).
[12] " And we are determined to live freemen " (MSS.).
[13] *i.e.*, *The Mercury* (as MSS., which omit the following parenthesis).
[14] MSS. omit.
[15] MSS. omit.
[16] " And fraud, or " MSS.
[17] " Trick or other, by which they have " (MSS.).

cannot produce a man born with a superfine coat on his back, and let me tell you that you have all an equal right to liberty and an equality of rights.[1]

He said a few days ago that if Brook, O'Connor and Bussey lifted a finger in revolt their lives would pay the forfeit. (*Groans.*) Let me tell you that this villain has been employed these eight years in[2] a revolution against the working men of England. (*Groans.*) He has been a leader of that revolution, and now because he thinks[3] they are determined to have Universal Suffrage, he says our lives shall pay the forfeit. (*Groans.*)[4] * * *

I am fully persuaded[5] that you men of Yorkshire will do[6] your duty. ("*We will.*") Let me tell you a secret: Baines told you two last week and I will tell you one now. What was it gained the independence of America? It was common sense and American Rifles. (*Loud cheering.*) If ever the people of England mean to obtain their independence, if ever they calculated upon uprooting the tyranny which now depressed their industry, they too will have to provide themselves with rifles. (*Cheers, and "We will."*) This is an inalienable right of every man in the nation, and that man is a slave, a villain and the murderer of his own family, that does not provide for himself a weapon of self-defence. (*Cheers.*)

Now let me say to every man amongst the hundreds of thousands which compose this vast assembly, let every man swear[7], by the love he bears his country, by the ashes of his forefathers, which are now intermingled with his native earth, by his wife, his children and his own right arm, that tyranny from this day shall virtually exist no longer. (*Great cheering.*) Every man of you who is determined to be a freeman or die in its attainment[8] let him now hold up his right arm. (*Every arm was held up.*)

[Note.—Gammage (*op. cit.*, p. 74) says of Peter Bussey:—

> "Mr. Bussey was the landlord of a beerhouse in Bradford, which was a favourite resort of numbers of the Radical party. He was a happy specimen of the barley Old English publican; his uncouth manner rendered him an especial favourite of the Bradford democrats, who regarded his bluntness as a proof of his genuine honesty. Without any desire to detract from the character of Mr. Bussey, we may remark that this is not an unexceptionable criterion by which to judge humanity. There is an affectation of coarseness as well as refinement, and it is sometimes the worst of the two. The speeches of the Bradford delegate always smacked of physical force, and he was pretty often complimented by Mr. O'Connor for the bravery of his language." Bussey fled overseas after the Newport insurrection.]

[1] MSS. Omit from " because."
[2] MSS. insert " working."
[3] " That the people have got the sense which will prevent them from being deceived any longer by damnable Whig sophistry."
[4] MSS. add: "And he is a liar."
[5] MSS. " Satisfied."
" Will not be humbugged, but will." (MSS.).
[7] " Man amongst you *swear* " (MSS.).
[8] " In his present position " (MSS.).

1838 October: Election of Chartist Convention.
1838 November 6: Dinner commemorating Henry Hunt at the Oak Tavern, Manchester, addressed by F. O'Connor.

55 SPEECH BY FEARGUS O'CONNOR ON PHYSICAL FORCE

[*After commemorating Hunt and recalling the Manchester massacres, he mentioned that a Mr. Salt, of the Birmingham Political Union, had "commented angrily" upon his—O'Connor's—views on physical force, and continued.*]

"GENTLEMEN, in endeavouring to gain honest popularity, I have never built my fame upon the ruin of others, neither shall I now, in justifying myself cast the least reproach upon my accuser. For of Mr. Salt I will say that he is a good man, and an honest patriot, but a misguided politician, unless he now sets us a moral lesson by which we can acquire without physical force that which he and others tell us is necessary for our very existence, namely, Universal Suffrage. (*Much cheering.*) And, gentlemen, although Mr. Salt has raked up reminiscences of private conversations which to me are honourable and from the acknowledgment of which I do not shrink, of him I will but say, that honest men often do the work of subtil knaves." (*Cheers.*)

No assertion, however, or misgiving of Mr. Salt's should cause misunderstanding between the Northern and the Birmingham Radicals, for he was ready to repair to the stronghold of his popularity, and as a common stranger defend himself before a jury of the Birmingham Radicals and allow them to decide between them—(*Hear, hear*)—and he now challenged him to the onset—(*Loud cheers*)—and in the contest might he say that his conduct met with their approval and that he possessed their unbounded confidence? ("*Yes, yes,*" *and loud cheers*).

"Look there," said Mr. O'Connor, pointing to a flag which was suspended behind him and upon which were the words "Peace—Law—Order?" "If this be your motto, then in proclaiming peace, do I act according to your guidance?—if *this* gives *this*," pointing to the inscription, "then I am for *this:* that is, if peace gives law, then I am for order; but if peace giveth not law, then I am for war to the knife"—confusion and disorder—(*uproarious and upstanding* (*sic*) *applause.*)[1]

56 REV. J. R. STEPHENS: "THE POLITICAL PREACHER"

FROM a sermon preached upon Ezekiel xxii, 29, 30, being the first sermon delivered by the Rev. Joseph Rayner Stephens after his release on bail pending

[1] Text from Place MSS.

a charge of conspiring to obstruct the operation of the Poor Law Amendment Act. Preached on January 6th, 1839, and published on January 26th, under the title of *The Political Preacher*.

* * * I am well aware, my brethren, that I have long been charged—indeed have always been charged—with a deviation—a positive departure from the line of duty prescribed to the profession of which I am an unworthy member, though I trust an upright, a sincere and a devoted one. It is said that I have dishonoured and desecrated the holy office, by neglecting the purely religious and spiritual claims which the church has made upon the time, the talents and the influence of her ministers; by postponing the discussion of abstract doctrines, the tenets of a metaphysically reasoned system of theology, or the admitted articles of a settled and established orthodoxy; and instead of this, or before this, or along with this, insisting on the obligation the whole Christian world is under to carry into actual, visible, immediate practice the plain precepts of that religion, whose first and last and only law on earth is that we should love our neighbour as ourself; doing unto others as we would they should do unto us * * * I have gone on to enquire, whether the principles of the factory system, for instance, are in accordance with the precepts of our most holy religion: whether Christian mill-owners are justified in pursuing a system of manufacture, which has done more to injure the health, impair the constitution, demoralize the character of a vast mass of our population, than any other recorded in history; which has made such a fearful waste of the natural, the social and the moral life of our industrious countrymen, that it has become a question, not only whether the silken chord that should bind society in love, can any longer hold her various members within its soft and peaceful circle; but whether the race itself, the human breed be not so far degenerate as to threaten imbecility, idiotcy or actual extinction to a most extensive and alarming degree? I have asked, especially, whether the principles of our modern political economy can be made to quadrate with the statements of divine revelation; whether it be indeed true that the earth is too small for its inhabitants; whether the beings born into the world are indeed too many and multiply too fast for its harvests, the production of its husbandry, and the supplies that lie hidden in the mysterious, inexhaustible storehouses of the great Creator of heaven and earth * * *

It is the imperative duty of every man to do all he can to restore his country to moral health and social soundness again, by the love he bears to his brethren, by the reverence he bears to the ashes of his fathers and by the oath that binds him in cheerful allegiance to the God of all his mercies. But most of all are the clergy called to this solemn service. The ministers of religion are the ambassadors of the Most High, the representatives of Jesus * * * The Bible shows us that every conspiracy against the liberties of nations is composed, in equal parts, of wicked prophets and wicked princes, the joint rulers, elders and shepherds of the people. Would the clergy of England, even now, at the eleventh hour, in God's name and in God's behalf, "judge the fatherless and plead for the widow," less than twelve months might change this wilder-

ness into a broad field of fertility and beauty. Should they, on the other hand, unhappily hold their peace, when they behold the wickedness that is committed in the land, join hands with the layman in grinding the faces of the poor, less than twelve months may seal the doom of both, and bring down upon all, our cup already all but running over, the righteous vengeance our sins have merited * * *

Moses, who, with his own hand, "slew the Egyptian," whom "he spied smiting a Hebrew, one of his brethren," was entrusted with the thunderbolts of an avenging God. To an earthly eye there appeared no token of a superintending providence. The "law" was enforced, and there were none to deliver the hapless bondsmen, who sighed and groaned to heaven as vainly, it might have seemed, as they cried and prayed to the legally appointed commissioners and guardians who were charged with the execution of the "Act," by which the Israelites were restrained from multiplying to the Malthusian point of a "surplus population." But though around was lamentation and woe, tribulation and anguish; though hope had fled away, and dark despair settled brooding with black wing upon dreary Goshen, where they dwelt; yet it is written; written to warn the wicked and cheer the drooping sufferers of a much more bloody age; it is written, read it proud oppressor of the poor and tremble; read it wayworn wanderer, lonely widow, broken-hearted mother weeping for thy children because they are not; read it ye outcasts of men and put your trust in God, who is indeed "nigh at hand and not afar off." "The children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage, and they cried; and their cry came up unto God by reason of the bondage. And God heard their groaning, and God remembered his covenant with Abraham, with Isaac and with Jacob. And God looked upon the children of Israel, and God had respect unto them." I need not follow Moses in the career of vengeance, which he was commanded to pursue

* * * I instance Egypt, because it shows you that the boasted discovery of Malthus, though decked out in all the bravery of a deceitful philosophy and paraded with all the pomp and circumstance of "science falsely so-called" is nothing more than a metempsychosis of the idolatry of the darkest ages of the world, a revival of the bloody practices of the most savage, immoral and inhuman nations, the first, and I hope the last, attempt ever made in Christendom to abolish the holy laws of Jesus and bring these "kingdoms of our God and of his Christ" under his dominion, who has been "a liar and a murderer from the beginning" * * * I instance Egypt because I wish every christian citizen, and especially every christian minister, to compare the condition of the Israelites under their taskmasters with the condition of Englishmen under the social slavery beneath which they groan. I call upon my fellow-countrymen generally, upon my brother clergymen of all denominations particularly to institute this comparison. They will then find that in every point of the comparison their christian brethren, born in the same land, heiring the same rights, baptised into the same faith, equally with themselves the

redeemed of the Lord "groan being burdened" with a heavier and far more bitter yoke. We are nowhere told that in Egypt the men were worked so hard or had to work so long as our fellow countrymen have; nor that the women were doomed to do man's work; nor that little children were driven to work at all as children and women are everywhere forced to do in the corn-fields, the coal pits and the cotton mills of Christian England. There is nothing said of hunger or nakedness, or roaming houseless abroad; of filth, rags, starvation and misery, such as is at this hour the hapless lot of millions of our fellow countrymen. Nor was the "law" to strangle and drown every male child half so inhuman, half so horrible a mode of "legislating for the independence and comfort" of the people "lest they should multiply" too fast and become too many for the security of the estates of their representatives, as the plan adopted and carried out by Christian statesmen in our own country under the provisions of the "Poor law amendment act." The Israelites still had their home and their hearth, their wife and such of their children as did not come under the "provisions of the act." They "dealt" mercifully as well as "wisely" with them in comparison with the "dealings" of the "Poor Law Commissioners for England and Wales," who break up every poor man's cottage, take away every poor man's wife, lay their bloody hands on every poor man's child, imprisoning, starving and destroying without mercy and without measure all the poor of England "lest they should multiply" and replenish the earth. Hence it is that I hail the proposed revival by Marcus[1] of the Egyptian theory of "limiting populousness." For this reason I hail his scientific discovery of "painless extinction," and I implore the Poor Law Commissioners to abandon their system of gratuitous torture, their endless modes of savage barbarity, and at once adopt the easier, more merciful and economical method recommended to their notice by this Christian successor of the magi of Egypt! But most solemnly, my brethren, I ask you whether God, who smote Egypt for crimes infinitely less atrocious than ours, will withhold the rod of his indignation from England; whether God who drowned Pharaoh and his heathen host in the red sea, on account of their impious invasion of his right, their blasphemously daring attempt to set aside and thwart and neutralize his prerogative, will suffer Christian statesmen to commit far more heinous crimes, far more horrible atrocities in his name and under the cloke of his authority. No, surely, no! England, land of bibles and abominations, land of Christian ordinances, and of infernal horrors, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon, for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of thy coming judgment than for thee! Ministers of Christ, the God of Moses bids you go up to the court of Pharaoh, and make one general, peradventure a last, "appeal from the pulpit on behalf of the poor!" The salvation or the destruction of your country hangs upon your lips.

1839 February 4: Convention meets.

[1] "Marcus": *On the Possibility of Limiting Populousness* and *On Populousness*, advocating the painless death of all poor children in a family more than three.

57 J. C. COOMBE: "WHAT IS THE OBJECT OF THE CHARTER?"

LEADER IN NO. 3 OF THE "LONDON DEMOCRAT," EDITED BY G. J. HARNEY AND J. C. COOMBE. SATURDAY, APRIL 27TH, 1839.

WHAT IS THE OBJECT OF THE PEOPLE'S CHARTER?

MY FRIENDS,—

THE undoubted answer is to obtain social and political equality. Some wiseacres may, perhaps, drop in a question, and ask what is meant by social and political equality, thinking (the stupid knaves) to overthrow the whole theory by simply asking the question. However, to show the coxcombs that the question is not only easily answered, but that equality is not quite so visionary as interested people have been in the habit of maintaining, I beg to give, in a few words, what I consider to be its true definition:—Political equality means that every individual in any given state, has the right not only to take a part in all political proceedings whatever, whether it be to give a vote for a member of Parliament or for a parish officer, but also that he has the right to fill any office of state, if the majority of his fellow citizens will and approve that he should do so—in other words, political equality means that no one individual man is better than another one, unless the majority of his fellow citizens declare him to be so. Political equality means that the minority must submit to the will of the majority, at the same time that freedom of speech and opinion is secured to all. Social equality means, that the mountains of wealth must be pulled down, and the valleys of want filled up. Social equality means that thousands of heads of cattle and swine must not be exported from Ireland annually, whilst her population are dying from want of food, and perishing for want of shelter and clothing. Social equality means, that the four courses to a meal, viz., fish, flesh, fowl and pudding, with a drop of something afterwards, is rather too barefaced, whilst the poor labourer, through whose sweat and toil all these good things are produced, is dragging on a wretched existence in want of even the common necessaries of life; in short, social equality means, that all shall have a good house to live in with a garden at the back or front, just as the occupier likes; good clothing to keep him warm, and to make him look respectable, and plenty of good food and drink to make him look and *feel* happy. Yes, my friends, social equality means, that though *all* must work, yet all must be happy. And now, having answered the inquirer as to what I consider social and political equality to mean, just let me ask you, kind reader, one single question, do you expect that such a state of things will ever come to pass, by going down on your bended knees and praying for it? Be not deceived, your tyrants, will never concede justice till they are compelled; never will they yield to your *demands* even till they are overcome by fire and sword, and driven or exterminated from the face of the earth; then

To arms, to arms, ye brave!
The avenging sword unsheath:
March on, march on, all hearts resolved
On victory or death!

J. C. COOMBE

1839 May 13: Convention moves to Birmingham Gradual secession of moderates.

58 THE EIGHT QUESTIONS OF THE CONVENTION

CONCLUSION OF THE "MANIFESTO OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE INDUSTRIOUS CLASSES."

* * * We respectfully submit the following propositions for your serious consideration:—

That at all the simultaneous public meetings, to be held, for the purpose of petitioning the Queen to call good men to her councils, as well as at all subsequent meetings of your Unions or Associations, up to the First of July, you submit the following Questions to the People there assembled:—

1 Whether they will be prepared AT THE REQUEST OF THE CONVENTION, to withdraw all sums of money they INDIVIDUALLY or COLLECTIVELY have placed in savings' banks, private banks, or in the hands of any person hostile to their just rights?

2 Whether, at the same request, they will be prepared immediately to convert all their paper money into gold?

3 Whether, IF THE CONVENTION SHALL DETERMINE that a SACRED MONTH will be necessary to prepare the millions to secure the Charter of their political salvation, they will FIRMLY resolve to abstain from their labours during that period, as well as from all intoxicating drinks?

4 Whether, according to their OLD CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT —a right which modern legislators would fain annihilate—they have prepared themselves WITH THE ARMS OF FREEMEN, TO DEFEND THE LAWS AND CONSTITUTIONAL PRIVILEGES THEIR ANCESTORS BEQUEATHED TO THEM.

5 Whether they will provide themselves with CHARTIST CANDIDATES, so as to be prepared to propose them for their representatives at the next general election; and, if returned BY SHOW OF HANDS, such candidates to consider themselves veritable representatives of the People—to meet in London at a time hereafter to be determined on?

6 Whether they will resolve to DEAL EXCLUSIVELY WITH CHARTISTS; and in all cases of persecution, rally round and protect all who may suffer in their righteous cause?

7 Whether, by all and every means in their power, they will perseveringly contend for the great objects of the People's Charter, and resolve that no COUNTER AGITATION FOR A LESS MEASURE OF JUSTICE shall divert them from their righteous object?

8 Whether the people will determine TO OBEY ALL THE JUST AND CONSTITUTIONAL REQUESTS OF THE MAJORITY OF THE CONVENTION?

After these simultaneous public meetings, the convention will hold its sittings, when, by its deliberations, its missionaries, or otherwise, it will endeavour to ascertain the opinions of the people on all these important questions; and, having thus carefully ascertained the opinions and determination of the country, immediately after the First of July, IT WILL PROCEED TO CARRY *the will of the* PEOPLE *into execution.*

Remember, brethren, our motto is "*Union, Prudence, and Energy!*" By these combined we shall win the People's Charter, in despite of the people's enemies. Hoping that you will steadfastly and cautiously observe this motto,

We remain, your faithful representatives,
THE MEMBERS OF THE CONVENTION
Signed by their order: HUGH CRAIG, *Chairman.*
WILLIAM LOVETT, *Secretary*[1]

59 INSURRECTIONARY LEAFLET SEIZED BY GENERAL NAPIER, MAY 23

DEAR BROTHERS! Now are the times to try men's souls! Are your arms ready? Have you plenty of powder and shot? Have you screwed up your courage to the sticking-place? Do you intend to be freemen or slaves? Are you inclined to hope for a fair day's wages for a fair day's work? Ask yourselves these questions, and remember that your safety depends on the strength of your own right arms. How long are you going to allow your mothers, your wives, your children and your sweethearts, to be ever toiling for other people's benefit? Nothing can convince tyrants of their folly but gunpowder and steel, *so put your trust in God my boys and keep your powder dry.* Be patient a day or two, but be ready at a minute's warning; no man knows to-day what to-morrow may bring forth: be ready then to nourish the tree of liberty,

WITH THE BLOOD OF TYRANTS.

You can get nothing by cowardice, or petitioning. France is in arms; Poland groans beneath the bloody Russian Yoke; and Irishmen pant to

[1] Mr. Hovell (*op. cit.*, p. 148), quotes a text from the *Charter* of May 19 which is different in very many respects. I have ventured to restore the true text from a copy of the original manifesto circulated (British Museum 1391, i, 4 (5)). Even the text in Lovett's *Life and Struggles*, p. 214, is not quite accurate. Messrs. Bland, Brown and Tawney (*English Economic History: Select Documents*, p. 642), who give this document, omit the latter half and erroneously state that it was "addressed to the Chartist Convention." It was, of course, addressed *by* the Convention to its local bodies.

enjoy the sweets of liberty. Aye, dear brethren, the whole world depends on you for support; if you fail the working man's sun is set for ever! The operatives of Paris have again took possession of the city. Can you remain passive when all the world is in arms? No, my friends! Up with the cap of liberty, down with all oppression and enjoy the benefits of your toil. Now or never is your time: be sure you do not neglect your arms, and when you strike do not let it be with sticks or stones, but *let the blood of all you suspect* moisten the soil of your native land, that you may for ever destroy even the remembrance of your poverty and shame.

Let England's sons then prime her guns
And save each good man's daughter,
In tyrant's blood baptize your sons
And every villain slaughter.
By pike and sword, your freedom strive to gain,
Or make one bloody Moscow of old England's plain.[1]

1839 July 4: Great Riot in Birmingham.

60 RESOLUTIONS ON THE BIRMINGHAM RIOT UNANIMOUSLY AGREED TO BY THE GENERAL CONVENTION

RESOLVED—1st, That this Convention is of opinion that a wanton flagrant and unjust outrage has been made upon the people of Birmingham by a bloodthirsty and unconstitutional force from London acting under the authority of men who, when out of office, sanctioned and took part in the meetings of the people, and now when they share in the public plunder seek to keep the people in social slavery and political degradation.

2nd. That the people of Birmingham are the best judges of their own right to meet in the Bull Ring or elsewhere, have their own feelings to consult respecting the outrage given, and are the best judges of their own power and resources to obtain justice.

3rd. That the summary and despotic arrest of Dr. Taylor, our respected colleague, affords another convincing proof of the absence of all justice in

[1] Napier commented: "This is a nice piece of advice! Well, I have just had out three regiments and two guns and they do not look as if they would be easily beaten!" (Letter to Colonel W. Napier, May 23.) The extreme alarm, however, caused by the Chartists and the universal expectation of an insurrection may be gathered from the following quotation from the General's Journal. It must be remembered General Napier had kept his head and was utterly contemptuous of the panic around him.

Nottingham, April 22nd, 1839.

"Yesterday a piece of letter was found in the park and sent to Sir C. O'Donnel, my brigade-major, by post. What does it mean? The words were written in pencil and the fragment run(s) thus:—

— y, wit Monday, that all of you must bring yure pistels..... day as their will be important..... is there no foot sogers tho' he sa ..... mee was coming so that the wat is ..... acks ..... not got over carts and such things as I saw how the done it at paris .....
..... ist get old .....
..... also that we .....

The dotted parts were torn. This indicates business."

Napier's Life and Opinions (ii, 12

England, and clearly shews that there is no security for life, liberty or property, till the people have some control over the laws they are called upon to obey.

By order,

Friday, July 5, 1839. W. Lovett, Sec.

1839 July 5: Arrest of Lovett.
1839 July 12: National Petition rejected.

61 FIRST NATIONAL PETITION

Unto the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled, the Petition of the undersigned, their suffering countrymen,

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

THAT we, your petitioners, dwell in a land where merchants are noted for enterprise, whose manufacturers are very skilful, and whose workmen are proverbial for their industry.

The land itself is goodly, the soil rich, and the temperature wholesome; it is abundantly furnished with the materials of commerce and trade; it has numerous and convenient harbours; in facility of internal communication it exceeds all others.

For three-and-twenty years we have enjoyed a profound peace.

Yet, with all these elements of national prosperity, and with every disposition and capacity to take advantage of them, we find ourselves overwhelmed with public and private suffering.

We are bowed down under a load of taxes; which, notwithstanding, fall greatly short of the wants of our rulers; our traders are trembling on the verge of bankruptcy; our workmen are starving; capital brings no profit and labour no remuneration; the home of the artificer is desolate, and the warehouse of the pawnbroker is full; the workhouse is crowded and the manufactury is deserted.

We have looked on every side, we have searched diligently in order to find out the causes of a distress so sore and so long continued.

We can find none in nature, or in Providence.

Heaven has dealt graciously by the people; but the foolishness of our rulers has made the goodness of God of none effect.

The energies of a mighty kingdom have been wasted in building up the power of selfish and ignorant men, and its resources squandered for their aggrandisement.

The good of a party has been advanced to the sacrifice of the good of the nation; the few have governed for the interests of the few, while the interest of the many has been neglected or insolently and tyrannously trampled upon.

It was the fond expectation of the people that a remedy for the greater part, if not for the whole, of their grievances, would be found in the Reform Act of 1832.

They were taught to regard that Act as a wise means to a worthy end; as the machinery of an improved legislation, when the will of the masses would be at length potential.

They have been bitterly and basely deceived.

The fruit which looked so fair to the eye has turned to dust and ashes when gathered.

The Reform Act has effected a transfer of power from one dominating faction to another, and left the people as helpless as before.

Our slavery has been exchanged for an apprenticeship to liberty, which has aggravated the painful feeling of our social degradation, by adding to it the sickening of still deferred hope.

We come before your Honourable House to tell you, with all humility, that this state of things must not be permitted to continue; that it cannot long continue without very seriously endangering the stability of the throne and the peace of the kingdom; and that if by God's help and all lawful and constitutional appliances, an end can be put to it, we are fully resolved that it shall speedily come to an end.

We tell your Honourable House that the capital of the master must no longer be deprived of its due reward;[1] that the laws which make food dear, and those which, by making money scarce, make labour cheap, must be abolished; that taxation must be made to fall on property, not on industry; that the good of the many, as it is the only legitimate end, so it must be the sole study of the government.

As a preliminary essential to these and other requisite changes, as means by which alone the interests of the people can be effectually vindicated and secured we demand that those interests be confided to the keeping of the people.

When the state calls for defenders, when it calls for money, no consideration of poverty or ignorance can be pleaded in refusal or delay of the call.

Required as we are, universally, to support and obey the laws, nature and reason entitle us to demand, that in the making of the laws, the universal voice shall be implicitly listened to.

We perform the duties of freemen; we must have the privileges of freemen.

WE DEMAND UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

The suffrage to be exempt from the corruption of the wealthy, and the violence of the powerful, must be secret.

The assertion of our right necessarily involves the power of its uncontrolled exercise.

WE DEMAND THE BALLOT.

The connection between the representatives and the people, to be beneficial must be intimate.

The legislative and constituent powers, for correction and for instruction, ought to be brought into frequent contact.

Errors, which are comparatively light when susceptible of a speedy popular remedy, may produce the most disastrous effects when permitted to grow inveterate through years of compulsory endurance.

[1] This, I imagine, shows the hand of Lovett, or possibly even of Place.

To public safety as well as public confidence, frequent elections are essential.

WE DEMAND ANNUAL PARLIAMENTS.

With power to choose, and freedom in choosing, the range of our choice must be unrestricted.

We are compelled, by the existing laws, to take for our representatives, men who are incapable of appreciating our difficulties, or who have little sympathy with them; merchants who have retired from trade, and no longer feel its harassings; proprietors of land who are alike ignorant of its evils and their cure; lawyers, by whom the honours of the senate are sought after only as a means of obtaining notice in the courts.

The labours of a representative, who is sedulous in the discharge of his duty, are numerous and burdensome.

It is neither just, nor reasonable, nor safe, that they should continue to be gratuitously rendered.

We demand that in the future election of members of your Honourable House, the approbation of the constituency shall be the sole qualification; and that to every representative so chosen shall be assigned, out of the public taxes, a fair and adequate remuneration for the time which he is called upon to devote to the public service.

Finally, we would most earnestly impress on your Honourable House, that this petition has not been dictated by any idle love of change; that it springs out of no inconsiderate attachment to fanciful theories; but that it is the result of much and long deliberation, and of convictions, which the events of each succeeding year tend more and more to strengthen.

The management of this mighty kingdom has hitherto been a subject for contending factions to try their selfish experiments upon.

We have felt the consequences in our sorrowful experience—short glimmerings of uncertain enjoyment swallowed up by long and dark seasons of suffering.

If the self-government of the people should not remove their distresses, it will at least remove their repinings.

Universal suffrage will, and it alone can, bring true and lasting peace to the nation; we firmly believe that it will also bring prosperity.

May it therefore please your Honourable House to take this our petition into your most serious consideration; and to use your utmost endeavours, by all constitutional means, to have a law passed, granting to every male of lawful age, sane mind and unconvicted of crime, the right of voting for members of Parliament; and directing all future elections of members of Parliament to be in the way of secret ballot; and ordaining that the duration of Parliaments so chosen shall in no case exceed one year; and abolishing all property qualifications in the members; and providing for their due remuneration while in attendance on their Parliamentary duties.

And your petitioners, etc.

1839 July 12: Convention calls a general strike.
1839 July 22: Convention withdraws its notice of a strike and adjourns till end of August.
1839 July, August, September: Decline of Chartism and repression throughout the country.
1839 November 4: Rising of colliers under John Frost at Newport defeated.
1839 November-December: Preparations for another rising fail. Renewed decline of Chartism.
1839 December 10: Frost and others tried.
1840 March 4: Frost, Jones and Williams transported.
1840 March-July: Imprisonment of all important Chartists: O'Brien, Jackson, Vincent, Holberry, O'Connor, Carrier, Roberts, Williams, Binns.
1841 Spring: Lovett's National Association founded. (Education, Anti-Corn Law, Co-operation with the Middle Classes. It drew away many of the older Chartists.)
1841 August: O'Connor released. Rapid growth of his power in the National Charter Association.
1841 Winter: O'Brien and anti-O'Connorites join J. Sturge's Complete Suffrage Association.
1842 May 2: Second National Petition presented and rejected.

62 EXTRACTS FROM THE SECOND NATIONAL PETITION

READ TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ON MAY 2, 1842.[1]

TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

The petition of the undersigned people of the United Kingdom, Sheweth,

* * * * * * * * *

THAT if your honourable House is of opinion that the people of Great Britain and Ireland ought not to be fully represented, your petitioners pray that such opinion may be unequivocally made known, that the people may fully understand what they can or cannot expect from your honourable House; because, if such be the decision of your honourable House, your petitioners are of opinion that where representation is denied, taxation ought to be resisted.

* * * * * * * * *

That bribery, intimidation, corruption, perjury, and riot, prevail at all Parliamentary elections, to an extent best understood by the Members of your honourable House.

[1] Signed by 3,315,752 persons. This petition adds largely to the 1839 Petition, while repeating all the old demands. I have extracted only the paragraphs containing the new points. Too long to be quoted in full, it is a far more interesting document than the better-known 1839 petition.

That your petitioners complain that they are enormously taxed to pay the interest of what is termed the national debt, a debt amounting at present to 800,000,000*l.*, being only a portion of the enormous amount expended in cruel and expensive wars for the suppression of all liberty, by men not authorised by the people, and who, consequently, had no right to tax posterity for the outrages committed by them upon mankind. And your petitioners loudly complain of the augmentation of that debt, after twenty-six years of almost uninterrupted peace, and whilst poverty and discontent rage over the land.

* * * * * * * * *

That in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, thousands of people are dying from actual want; and your petitioners, whilst sensible that poverty is the great exciting cause of crime, view with mingled astonishment and alarm the ill provision made for the poor, the aged and infirm; and likewise perceive, with feelings of indignation, the determination of your honourable House to continue the Poor Law Bill in operation, notwithstanding the many proofs which have been afforded by sad experience of the unconstitutional principal,[1] of its unchristian character and of the cruel and murderous effects produced upon the wages of working men, and the lives of the subjects of this realm.

* * * * * * * * *

That your petitioners, with all due respect and loyalty, would compare the daily income of the sovereign Majesty with that of thousands of the working men of this nation; and whilst your petitioners have learned that her Majesty receives daily for her private use the sum of 164*l.* 17s. 10d. they have also ascertained that many thousands of the families of the labourers are only in the receipt of 3¾d. per head per day.

That your petitioners have also learned that his royal Highness Prince Albert receives each day the sum of 104*l.* 2s., whilst thousands have to exist upon 3d. per head per day.

That your petitioners have also heard with astonishment, that the King of Hanover daily receives 57*l.* 10s., whilst thousands of the taxpayers of this empire live upon 2¾d. per head per day.

That your petitioners have, with pain and regret, also learned that the Archbishop of Canterbury is daily in receipt of 52*l.* 10s. per day, whilst thousands of the poor have to maintain their families upon an income not exceeding 2d. per head per day.

That notwithstanding the wretched and unparalleled condition of the people, your honourable House has manifested no disposition to curtail the expenses of the State, to diminish taxation, or promote general prosperity.

* * * * * * * * *

That your petitioners complain that the rights has unconstitutionally been infringed; and 500 well-disposed persons have been arrested, excessive

[1] So *Hansard*.
[2] Of public meeting.

bail demanded, tried by packed juries, sentenced to imprisonment and treated as felons of the worst description.

* * * * * * * * *

That your petitioners complain that the hours of labour, particularly of the factory workers, are protracted beyond the limits of human endurance, and that the wages earned, after unnatural application to toil in heated and unhealthy workshops, are inadequate to sustain the bodily strength, and supply those comforts which are so imperative after an excessive waste of physical energy.

That your petitioners also direct the attention of your honourable House to the starvation wages of the agricultural labourer, and view with horror and indignation the paltry income of those whose toil gives being to the staple food of this people.

* * * * * * * * *

That your petitioners complain that upwards of nine million pounds per annum are unjustly abstracted from them to maintain a church establishment from which they principally dissent.

* * * * * * * * *

That your petitioners have viewed with great indignation the partiality shown to the aristocracy in the courts of justice, and the cruelty of that system of law which deprived Frost, Williams and Jones, of the benefit of the objection offered by Sir Frederick Pollock during the trial at Monmouth, and which was approved of by a large majority of the judges.

* * * * * * * * *

And your petitioners, etc.

1842 August: Spontaneous outbreak of strikes in the North of England.

63*a* RESOLUTION CALLING THE STRIKE

RESOLUTION OF THE TRADE UNION DELEGATES AND OTHERS AT MANCHESTER ON AUGUST 12, 1842.

THAT we, the delegates representing the various trades of Manchester and its vicinities, with delegates from various parts of Lancashire and Yorkshire, do most emphatically declare, that it is our solemn and conscientious conviction that all the evils that afflict society, and which have prostrated the energies of the great body of the producing classes, arise solely from class legislation; and that the only remedy for the present alarming distress and widespread destitution is the immediate and unmutilated adoption and carrying into law [*of*] the document known as the people's charter.

That this meeting recommend the people of all trades and callings forthwith to cease work, until the above document becomes the law of the land.

63*b* PLACARD ISSUED ON AUGUST 15 BY THE SAME DELEGATES

LIBERTY.

LIBERTY to the trades of Manchester and the surrounding districts—Fellow-workmen, we hasten to lay before you the paramount importance of this day's proceedings. The delegates from the surrounding districts have been more numerous at this day's meeting than they were at yesterday's, and the spirit and determination manifested for the people's rights have increased every hour. In consequence of the unjust and unconstitutional interference of the magistrates our proceedings were abruptly brought to a close by their dispersing the meeting; but not until, in their very teeth, we passed the following resolution:—"Resolved—that the delegates in public meeting assembled, do recommend to the various constituencies which we represent, to adopt all legal means to carry into effect the People's Charter; and further we recommend that delegates be sent through the whole of the country to endeavour to obtain the co-operation of the middle and working classes in carrying out the resolution of ceasing labour until the Charter become the law of the land."[1]

Englishmen, legally determine to maintain the peace and well-being of Society; and show, by your strict adherence to our resolution, that we are your true representatives. Do your duty, We will do ours. We meet again to-morrow: and the result of our deliberations will be fully laid before you.

1842 August 17: Charter Association recognises the strike.
1842 August: Strike spreading. "Plug riots."
1842 August-September: Strike broken partly by soldiers. Wholesale arrests.
1842 December 30: Split between the Chartists and the Complete Suffrage Association.[2]
1843 O'Connor turns to popularising his land scheme.
1843-7 Collapse of Chartism.
1845 Opposition to Trades Unions and Free Traders abandoned.
1846 O'Connorville founded by O'Connor's *National Land Company*.
1847 O'Connor elected for Nottingham.

64 FEARGUS O'CONNOR ON COMMUNISM[3]

* * * I have been, and I think I ever shall be, opposed to the principle of COMMUNISM, as advocated by several theorists. I am, nevertheless, a strong advocate of co-operation, which means legitimate exchange, and which circumstances would compel individuals to adopt to the extent that com-

[1] 320 voting for it out of 328.
[2] See p. 109. This is a middle-class conciliatory organisation founded by Joseph Sturge. the Quaker
[3] *The Labourer*, vol. i, p. 149: " A Treatise on the Small Proprietory System and the National Land and Labour Bank shewing the mode by which every working man may become possessed of a comfortable cottage, with a sufficient quantity of land to occupy him in producing all the comforts and necessaries of life for himself and his family." At the end, characteristically, I HAVE WRITTEN A TREATISE AS DURABLE AS THE LAND.—Your faithful friend, FEARGUS O'CONNOR.

munism would be beneficial. I have generally found that the strongest advocates of communism are the most lazy members of society—a class who would make a division of labour, adjudging to the most pliant and submissive the lion's share of work, and contending that their natural implement was the brain, whilst that of the credulous was the spade, the plough, the sledge and the pickaxe. Communism either destroys wholesome emulation and competition, or else it fixes too high a price on distinction, and must eventually end in the worst description of despotism—the despotism of self-surrender and non-reliance on self; whilst upon the other hand individual possession, and co-operation of labour, creates a wholesome bond between all classes of society, which none can push beyond the will or requirement of his neighbour * * * In a community a large minority might, and most probably would, be dissatisfied and discontented; whilst in a section of individual possessors, no matter howsoever extensive, a man could only grumble with himself. For these reasons I am an advocate for

INDIVIDUALS POSSESSING A SELF-CONTROL.

If, then, we consider man in his individual capacity, and not as a member of that general system of COMMUNISM which I contend now prevails, we must come to the conclusion, that not only his usefulness to society, but his HAPPINESS, should be legislated for; and, to effect the double object, of making him useful to society and happy, I assert that there is no available, nay, no possible means, other than assigning to him just the amount of land, which by his own labour, or by labour upon the principle of co-operation, he can conveniently cultivate.

* * * What I mean by co-operation is this: A, B, C, and D, or any other four, are neighbours. A is ready to perform some spring or harvest work, at which the labour of four men for a day may be worth one man's labour for six. The season must be served in seed time and harvest. A may be ready to sow, or plant, or reap, B, C and D may not, and, not being particularly engaged, their time may not be valuable; but by going a day to A, who should return it when they were ready, the time, otherwise comparatively valueless, may be made extremely valuable—now, *that* is co-operative labour, of which farmers on a large scale never could avail themselves. Again, a man with four acres would be very foolish to purchase a threshing machine, or to keep a horse; but as the demand ensures the supply, one man might find it to his advantage to keep several horses, to hire out as required to occupants, to take gross produce to market or to put out manure; and so another might find it to his advantage to keep a threshing machine to work for hire. Whereas, if horses and machines were common property, such is the perverseness of human nature, that all would CONTRIVE to require the use of both horses and machines precisely at the same time.

I am even opposed to public kitchens, public baking-houses, and public wash-houses. In fact, I am for the principle of MEUM and TUUM—MINE and THINE

1848 February-March: Continental Revolutions.
1848 March 6: Police driven from Trafalgar Square by Chartists.
1848 April 4: Convention again meets.

65 RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONVENTION ON APRIL 5

1st. That in the event of the National Petition being rejected by the House of Commons, this Convention prepare a National Memorial to the Queen to dissolve the present Parliament, and call to her council such ministers only as will make the People's Charter a cabinet measure.

2nd. That this Convention agree to the convocation of a National Assembly, to consist of delegates appointed at public meetings, to present the National Memorial[1] to the Queen and to continue permanently sitting until the Charter is the law of the land.

3rd. That this Convention call upon the country to hold simultaneous meetings on Good Friday, April 21st, for the purpose of adopting the National Memorial, and electing delegates to the National Assembly.

4th. That the National Assembly meet in London on April 24th.

5th. That the present Convention shall continue its sittings until the meeting of the National Assembly.

1848 April 10: Petition presented. Chartist demonstration collapses.
1848 May 23: Committee of the House of Commons appointed to investigate O'Connor's National Land Company. Declares it must be wound up.
1848-1858 Disappearance of Chartism.
1852 O'Connor becomes insane.

66 "THE SONG OF THE LOWER CLASSES"

By Ernest Jones.[2]

WE plough and sow—we're so very, very low
That we delve in the dirty clay,
Till we bless the plain—with the golden grain,
And the vale with the fragrant hay.
Our place we know—we're so very low,
'Tis down at the landlord's feet:
We're not too low—the bread to grow,
But too low the bread to eat.

Down, down we go—we're so very, very low,
To the hell of the deep sunk mines,
But we gather the proudest gems that glow
Where the crown of a despot shines.

[1] Never presented, so complete was the collapse.

[2] Undated broadsheet, with the note: "Music by John Lawry—this song can also be sung to the air of *The Monks of Old*." It contains also *A Song of Cromwell's Time*. It was undoubtedly published in the latest days of Jones's agitation, probably about 1854. The chorus is the last two lines of the verse repeated.

And whenever he lacks—upon our backs
Fresh loads he deigns to lay:
We're far too low to vote the tax,
But not too low to pay.

We're low—we're low—mere rabble, we know,
But at our plastic power
The mould at the lordlings' feet will grow
Into palace and church and tower—
Then prostrate fall—in the rich man's hall,
And cringe at the rich man's door:
We're not too low to build the wall,
But too low to tread the floor.

We're low—we're low—we're very, very low,
Yet from our fingers glide
The silken flow—and the robes that glow
Round the limbs of the sons of pride.
And what we get—and what we give—
We know, and we know our share:
We're not too low the cloth to weave,
But too low the cloth to wear!

We're low—we're low—we're very, very low,
And yet when the trumpets ring,
The thrust of a poor man's arm will go
Through the heart of the proudest king.
We're low—we're low—our place we know
We're only the rank and file,
We're not too low to kill the foe,
But too low to touch the spoil.[1]

1854 Chartist Executive not elected.
1855 O'Connor dies.

[1] The use of the " — " to indicate internal rhymes is Ernest Jones's own.

Chapter IV
The Revolutions of 1848

PROLOGUE. *The Communist Manifesto*
SECTION I. *The French Revolution*
SECTION II. *The Hungarian Revolution*
SECTION III. *The Italian Revolution*
SECTION IV. *The German Revolution*
SECTION V. *The Irish Revolutionaries*
EPILOGUE. *The Republican Manifesto of* 1855

PROLOGUE

67 The Communist Manifesto 1847

Introduction

IT would be an impertinence upon my part to venture to criticise or elucidate the document which follows. Yet, while the argument of the Manifesto may be left to explain itself, it will not be superfluous to explain its historical importance.

Marx was a leader of the greatest weight in the German Communist movement, but in that movement alone. He had only very indirect influence in the Chartist movement and none at all in France. Hence, in the latter country, where Socialism alone came out into the daylight, the influence of this document was small. And since France was the pivot of the whole Revolution, it might be thought that this document was unimportant.

However, with the first conscious proletarian movement it is fitting that there should be classed the first definite formulation of its aims and meaning. Hitherto, Communists had had little grasp of social evolution as applied to their movement. All opposition to Socialism was "wicked" and "sinful," it was the evil principle fighting against the light. Socialism was a thing devoid of preconditions: a universal formula to cure any society, whose application was only delayed by ignorance and wicked men. "We have but to will it," said Maréchal, grandly. It was the old fight between virtue and vice. And if the appeal to reason failed—as it always did—what then? Why, nothing was left but violence: conspiracy, assassination, revolts: continual and incessant attempts at revolution, and, at all costs, no peace and quiet for the oppressor.

The Communist Manifesto not only changed an incoherent movement—a movement with a programme whose inadequacy it uneasily felt—into a movement with a programme which was a perfect instrument: not only did it turn Socialism for ever from the paths of secret conspiracy into those of open propaganda; it gave to it its place in history. It destroyed the old "moral" divisions of parties in favour of a new and truer historical appreciation of them. It showed the bourgeoisie to be, not an aggregation of monsters, but a class produced by historical necessity and doomed in time to make way for the proletariat; it showed capitalism, not as the reign of Anti-Christ, but as the loosening of gigantic forces which would in time lead to Communism. By this it destroyed for ever the occupation of the founders of Utopias and made Socialism a thing of world import and not, as Blanqui puts it, "an egg hatched in an obscure corner of the earth." It also gave Communism a dignity it had not had before and brought it into the open, freed it from the tradition of secret societies, conspiracy and incessant violence. Not, indeed, that Marx opposed a Revolution of force. But now the Communists had their eyes open: they could see the signs of the times, and could afford to wait and pick their time: nor had they any excuse for believing that forty-eight hours of insurrection would at once make the whole world Socialist.

* * * * * * * * *

London, 1847

This manifesto was issued by the organisation commonly known as the Federation of the Just. This secret society, German in origin, was a section—in fact, if not in theory, the German section—of Barbès' and Blanqui's Society of the Seasons. This was one of Blanqui's many organisations to undermine the monarchy of Louis Philippe. It perished in a futile attempt at insurrection in Paris in May, 1839. With it was shattered the Federation of the Just. Two groups of refugees only remained, in London and in Switzerland. Both were under the influence of Weitling,[1] but the London group gradually, from 1843 onwards, had its theories shattered by contact with Marx and Engels. Weitling, after vainly attempting to purify his party, went to America and left the Federation to Marx's mercy. Marx and Engels joined it in 1847, and a preliminary congress held in the summer of that year instructed them to produce a programme to supplant Weitling's mixture of Babouvism and Fourierism. The name of the Society was changed to the "Communist Federation," and secrecy was as far as possible abandoned. A second congress met in November and December, 1847, which, after a ten-days' discussion, approved the report, which was published as the Communist Manifesto. Almost immediately the revolution of 1848 broke out.

NOTE.—See—Ch. Andler: *Le Manifeste Communiste*, critical edition in two small volumes.
K. Marx: *Enthüllungen über den Kommunistenprozess.*
J. Spargo: *Life of Marx*, ch. 6.
G. Sorel: *La Decomposition du Marxisme.*
A. Labriola: *Essays on the Materialist Conception of History*, No. I.

67 MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

A SPECTRE is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have united in a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre. The Pope and the Czar, Metternich, and Guizot, the radicals of France, and the police-spies of Germany.

Where is the opposition party that has not been accused of Communism by its opponents in power? Where is the opposition party that has not, in its turn, hurled back at its adversaries, progressive or reactionary, the branding epithet of Communism?

Two things result from these facts:

Communism is now recognised by all European Powers to be itself a power.

It is high time that Communists should lay before the whole world their point of view, their aims and their tendencies, and set against this fable of the spectre of Communism a Manifesto of the Party itself.

To this end the Communists of different nationalities have assembled in London and formulated the following Manifesto, which will be published in English, French, German, Italian, Flemish, and Danish.

[1] See for his views, Ch. Andler: *Le Manifeste Communiste* II, 10, and Kaler: *Wilhelm Weitling.*

I.

Bourgeois and Proletarians.

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.

Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, baron and serf, guild master and journeyman, in one word, oppressor and oppressed, standing constantly in opposition to each other, carried on an uninterrupted warfare, now open, now concealed; a warfare which always ended either in a revolutionary transformation of the whole of society or in the common ruin of the contending classes.

In early historic epochs we find almost everywhere a complete organisation of society into various degrees, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we find patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guildmasters, apprentices, and serfs, and within almost all of these classes again further divisions.

Modern bourgeois society, springing from the wreck of feudal society, had not abolished class antagonisms. It has but substituted new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of warfare, for the old.

Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, the distinctive characteristic that it has simplified class antagonisms. All society is more and more splitting up into two opposing camps, into two great hostile classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

From the serfs of the Middle Ages sprang the chartered burghers of the first towns; from these burghers evolved the first elements of the bourgeoisie.

The discovery of America, the rounding of the Cape, opened up a new field of action for the rising bourgeoisie. The East Indian and Chinese markets, the colonisation of America, colonial trade, the increase of the means of exchange and of wealth in general, gave an impulse, unknown before, to commerce, navigation and industry, and therewith a rapid development to the revolutionary element in the decaying feudal society.

The former feudal system of industry could no longer satisfy the growing needs which arose with the opening up of new markets. The manufacturing system took its place. The guildmasters were displaced by the industrial middle class. Division of labour among the different corporate guilds disappeared before division of labour in each single workshop.

But markets ever expanded and the demand ever increased. Even manufacture no longer sufficed. Then steam and machinery revolutionised industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by gigantic Modern Industry, and the place of the industrial middle class was taken by the industrial millionaires, the leaders of whole armies of industrial workers, the modern bourgeoisie.

Modern Industry has established that world-market for which the discovery of America prepared the way. The world-market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, and to communication by land. This development reacted in its turn on the expansion of industry, and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, and railways extended,

in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, multiplied its capital, and thrust into the background all classes transmitted from the Middle Ages.

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the methods of production and exchange.

Each step in the evolution of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political progress. An oppressed class under the rule of the feudal lords, an armed and self-governing association in the mediæval commune, here an independent urban republic, there a *Third Estate* taxable by the monarchy, afterwards in the manufacturing period serving either the semi-feudal or absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, everywhere acting as the corner-stone of the great monarchies—the bourgeoisie, since the establishment of modern industry and the world-market, has at last conquered exclusive political power in the modern representative State. The modern State is but an executive committee for administering the affairs of the whole bourgeois class.

The bourgeoisie has played in history a most revolutionary part.

The bourgeoisie, wherever it has conquered power, has destroyed all feudal, patriarchal, and idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder all the many-coloured feudal bonds which united men to their "natural superiors," and has left no other tie twixt man and man but naked self-interest and callous cash payment. It has drowned religious ecstasy, chivalrous enthusiasm, and middle class sentimentality in the ice-cold water of egotistical calculation. It has transformed personal worth into mere exchange value, and substituted for countless dearly-bought chartered freedoms the one and only unconscionable freedom of Free Trade. It has, in one word, replaced an exploitation veiled by religious and political illusions by exploitation open, unashamed, direct, and brutal.

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every profession previously venerated and regarded as honourable. It has turned doctor, lawyer, priest, poet, and philosopher into its paid wage-workers.

The bourgeoisie has torn away the veil of sentiment from the family relation, and reduced it to a mere money relation.

The bourgeoisie has shown how the brutal manifestation of force, which the reactionaries admire so much in the Middle Ages, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what human activity can accomplish. It has created very different marvels from the Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted very different expeditions from the ancient migrations and Crusades.

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without incessantly revolutionising the instruments of production, and thereby the methods of production, and consequently all social relations. The preservation of the old methods of production was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all previous industrial classes. This continual revolutionising of the methods of production, con-

stant disturbance of the whole social system, perpetual agitation and uncertainty, distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all others. All fixed and deeply rooted social relations, with their train of established and venerated beliefs and ideas, are dissolved; all that replaces them grows old before it can crystallise. All that was solid and established crumbles away, all that was holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to look with open eyes upon his conditions of life and true social relations.

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole globe: Everywhere it must make its nest, everywhere settle, and everywhere establish its connections.

The bourgeoisie has, by the exploitation of the world-market, given a cosmopolitan character to the production and consumption of all countries. It has, to the despair of reactionaries, cut from under the feet of industry its national basis. Old established national industries have been destroyed, and are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries; whose introduction becomes a vital question for all civilised nations; by industries which no longer use native raw material, but raw material brought from the furthest zone, and whose products are consumed not only in their own countries, but in every quarter of the globe. Instead of the old wants, satisfied by the products of the country, new wants arise, demanding for their satisfaction the products of the most distant lands and climes. Instead of the old local and national isolation and self-sufficiency, universal trade has developed and the interdependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual productions of one nation become the common property of all. National narrowness and exclusiveness become daily more and more impossible, and out of the many national and local literatures a world literature arises.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all the instruments of production, and by constantly facilitating communication, draws into civilisation even the most barbarian nations. The cheapness of its commodities is the heavy artillery with which it lays low all Chinese walls, with which it compels the most obstinately hostile barbarians to capitulate. It forces all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it forces them to adopt so-called civilisation, *i.e.*, to become bourgeois. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the town. It has created enormous cities; it has prodigiously augmented the numbers in the towns as compared with the rural districts, and thus has rescued a great part of the population from the idiocy of country life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the town, so has it made barbaric, or semi-barbaric countries dependent on civilised countries, nations of peasants on bourgeois nations, the Orient on the Occident.

The bourgeoisie ever more and more arrests the dispersion of the means of production, property, and population. It has agglomerated population, centralised the means of production, and concentrated property in the hands

of a few. The necessary consequence of this was political centralisation. Independent, or loosely connected provinces having separate interests, laws, governments, and tariffs, were lumped together into a single nation, with one government, one constitution, one national class interest, one customs-tariff.

The bourgeoisie, during its class rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more powerful and colossal productive forces than all past generations together. Subjection of the forces of nature, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steamships, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalisation of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground—what previous century even suspected that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labour?

Thus have we seen the means of production and exchange, on whose basis the bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage of the development of these means of production and exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacture, in one word, feudal property relations, become no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces. They hampered production instead of aiding it. They became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder.

Into their place stepped free competition with its corresponding social and political constitution, with the economic and political rule of the bourgeois class.

Under our own eyes a similar movement is going on. Bourgeois conditions of production and exchange, bourgeois property relations, modern bourgeois society which has conjured up such gigantic means of production and exchange, is like a magician who is no longer able to control the infernal powers he has evoked. For many years the history of industry and commerce has been but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations which are the conditions of life for the bourgeoisie and its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises which, in their periodical recurrence, bring into question, each time more threateningly, the existence of the whole of bourgeois society. In these crises a great part, not only of existing products, but also of previously created productive forces, are periodically destroyed. In these crises a social epidemic breaks out, which would have seemed an absurdity in all previous epochs—the epidemic of over-production. Society finds itself suddenly thrown back into a state of momentary barbarism; a famine, a universal war of devastation, seems to have cut off the supply of all means of life. Industry and commerce seem to be destroyed—and why? Because there is too much civilisation, too much of the means of life, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society are no longer favourable to the development of bourgeois property conditions; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered; and so soon as they free themselves from these fetters they

bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, they endanger the existence of bourgeois property. The bourgeois system has become too narrow to contain the wealth which it creates. How does the bourgeoisie overcome these crises? On the one hand, by compelling the destruction of a mass of productive forces; on the other hand, by the conquest of new markets and the more thorough exploitation of the old markets. And with what result? With the result that they pave the way for more widespread and more destructive crises, and at the same time diminish the means whereby those crises can be avoided.

The weapons with which the bourgeoisie conquered feudalism are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself.

But the bourgeoisie has not only forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also produced the men who will wield these weapons—the modern workers, the PROLETARIANS.

In proportion as the bourgeoisie, *i.e.*, capital, is developed, in the same proportion is developed the Proletariat, the class of modern workers, who live only so long as they find work, and who only find work so long as their work increases capital. These workers, forced to sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, and all the fluctuations of the market.

The work of the Proletariat has been deprived of its individual character by the extended use of machinery and the division of labour, and therewith all its attraction for the worker has been lost. He becomes a mere appendage of the machine, of whom only the simplest, most monotonous and easily learned operations are required. The cost of production of the worker is in consequence reduced almost entirely to the means of subsistence that he requires for his maintenance and for the propagation of his race. Now the price of a commodity, and therefore of labour, is equal to the cost of its production. In proportion therefore as the repulsiveness of the labour increases the wage decreases. Furthermore, in proportion as the use of machinery and division of labour increase, in the same proportion does the burden of labour increase, either by prolongation of the working hours, by increase of the work exacted in a given time, or by the increased speed of the machine, etc.

Modern industry has converted the little workshop of the patriarchal master into the great factory of the industrial capitalist. Masses of workers, crowded together in the factories, are organised like soldiers. Like soldiers of industry, they are placed under the command of a perfect hierarchy of subalterns and officers. They are not only the slaves of the bourgeois class, the bourgeois State, they are daily and hourly enslaved by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself. The more openly this despotism proclaims gain to be its object, the more petty, hateful, and galling it becomes.

The less dexterity and strength are required in manual labour, *i.e.*, the more modern industry develops, the more is the labour of men displaced by that of women. The differences of age and sex have no longer any social importance for the working class. All are now mere instruments of labour, whose price varies according to age and sex.

No sooner is the exploitation of the worker by the employer so far at an end that he receives his bare money-wage, then he is set upon by other sections of the bourgeoisie, the landlord, the shopkeeper, the pawnbroker, etc.

The little middle class, the small shopkeepers, trades-people, peasant proprietors, handicraftsmen and peasants, all these classes sink into the proletariat, partly because their small capital is not sufficient for modern industry and is crushed out in the competition with the large capitalists, and partly because their specialised skill is depreciated by the new methods of production. Thus is the proletariat recruited from all classes of the population.

The proletariat goes through various evolutionary stages. Its struggle against the bourgeoisie begins with its birth.

At first it is a struggle of individual workers; then of the workers in one factory; then of the workers of the same trade in one locality against the capitalist who directly exploits them. They do not direct their attacks against the bourgeois mode of production, they direct them against the instruments of production themselves; they destroy foreign competing wares, they break the machines, set fire to factories; they seek to restore by force the lost position of the worker of the Middle Ages.

At this stage the workers form an incoherent mass scattered over the whole country and disunited by competition. When they unite to form more compact bodies it is not as yet the result of their own union, but of the union of the bourgeoisie, which to gain its own political ends must set in motion the entire proletariat, and is yet, for a time, able to do so. At this stage the proletariat does not fight its own enemies, but the enemies of its enemies, the remnants of the absolute monarchy, the landowners, the non-industrial and petty-bourgeoisie. The whole historical movement is thus concentrated in the hands of the bourgeoisie, every victory so obtained is a victory for the bourgeoisie.

But with the development of industry the proletariat not only increases in number; it is concentrated in larger masses, its strength grows and it feels that strength more. The interests, the life conditions within the proletariat, become always more equalised as machinery more and more obliterates all distinctions of labour and reduces wages almost everywhere to the same low level. With the growing competition among capitalists, and the consequent commercial crises, the workers' wages fluctuate more and more. The unceasing improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their whole livelihood increasingly insecure; the collisions between the individual workers and the individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. The workers begin thereupon to form combinations against the bourgeoisie; they combine together to keep up the rate of wages. They form themselves into permanent associations to provide beforehand for the occasional struggles. Here and there the struggle breaks out into revolt.

From time to time the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The

real fruit of their struggle lies not in the immediate result, but in the always growing unity of the workers. This is aided by the improved means of communication which are created by modern industry, and which bring the workers of different localities into contact with one another. This was just the contact required to centralise the numerous local struggles, all of the same character, into a national, into a class struggle. Now every class struggle is a political struggle. And the union, which it took centuries for the burghers of the Middle Ages with their wretched highways, to establish, the modern proletariat achieves by means of railways in a few years.

This organisation of the proletarians into a class, and, consequently, into a political party, is continually hampered by the competition among the workers themselves. But it always arises again, stronger, firmer, mightier. It compels legislative recognition of particular working class interests by profiting by the divisions within the bourgeoisie itself. For instance, the Ten Hours' Bill in England.

The collisions between the classes of the old society further in many ways the development of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie finds itself in a perpetual state of warfare: at first with the aristocracy; later with those sections of the bourgeoisie itself whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry; at all times with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries. In all these battles it finds itself compelled to appeal to the proletariat, to call for its aid, and thus to draw it into the political arena. It thus provides the proletariat with the elements of social education, *i.e.*, with the weapons to be used against the bourgeoisie itself.

Furthermore, as we have seen, by the advance of industry whole sections of the ruling class are precipitated into the ranks of the proletariat, or their livelihood is at least threatened. They also supply the proletariat with numerous elements of progress.

Finally, at the moment when the class struggle approaches the decisive hour, the process of dissolution within the ruling class, within the whole of society in fact, takes a character so violent and glaring, that a small part of the ruling class cuts itself off and joins the revolutionary class, the class which holds the future in its hands. Just as formerly, a portion of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat, and particularly that portion of the bourgeois ideologists who have reached a theoretical understanding of the whole historical movement.

Of all the classes which stand at present in opposition to the bourgeoisie the proletariat alone is a truly revolutionary class. The other classes decay and go under before modern industry; the proletariat is its special and direct product.

The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the small shopkeeper, the peasant proprietor, all struggle against the bourgeoisie to save from extinction their position as sections of the middle class. They are therefore not revolutionary, but conservative. And what is more, they are reactionary, because they try to turn back the wheel of history. Should they ever be revolutionary,

they are so from fear of being forced down into the ranks of the proletariat, thus defending not their present but their future interests, and thus abandoning their own standpoint to adopt that of the proletariat.

The slum population, that passively putrifying scum of the lowest layers of past society, is sometimes set in movement by a proletarian revolution, but its whole conditions of life prepare it rather to sell itself to the reactionary forces.

The social conditions of past society are already swamped in the social conditions of the proletariat. The proletarian is propertiless; his relations to wife and children have nothing now in common with bourgeois family relations; modern industrial labour, modern enslavement by capital, the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany, has despoiled him of all national character. Law, morality, religion, are for him merely so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which as many bourgeois interests are concealed.

All previous classes that have conquered power tried to consolidate their acquired position by subjecting the whole of society to their own mode of appropriation. The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society without abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and with it every other previous mode of production. The proletarians have nothing of their own to secure. They must destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property.

All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the conscious movement of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of existing society cannot stir, cannot raise itself up without the whole of the higher strata forming official society being sprung into the air.

Though not the substance, yet the form of the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, is national at first. The proletariat of each country naturally must first settle accounts with its own bourgeoisie.

In sketching the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we have depicted the more or less concealed civil war within existing society up to the point where it breaks out into open revolution, and where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation of the rule of the proletariat.

All previous forms of society were based, as we have seen, on the antagonism of the oppressing and oppressed classes. But in order to be able to oppress a class it is at least necessary to guarantee to it the conditions for continuing its slavish existence. The serf in feudal times raised himself to membership in the commune, just as the petty-bourgeois attained the position of a bourgeois under the yoke of feudal absolutism. The modern worker, on the contrary, instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks ever deeper beneath the social conditions of his own class. The labourer becomes the pauper, and pauperism increases even more rapidly than population and wealth. It is thus clear that the bourgeoisie is unfit any longer to remain the ruling class in

society, and to impose on society as a supreme law the social system of its class. It is unfit to rule because it is unable to assure existence in slavery to its slave, because it is forced to let him sink into a state in which it must feed him, instead of being fed by him. Society can exist under its rule no longer, *i.e.*, its existence is no longer compatible with that of society.

The essential condition for the existence and rule of the bourgeois class is the accumulation of wealth in private hands, the formation and increase of capital; the essential condition of capital is wage-labour. Wage-labour rests entirely on the competition among the workers. The progress of industry, of which the bourgeoisie is the involuntary and irresistible agent, replaces the isolation of the workers, due to competition, by their revolutionary union through association. With the development of modern industry, therefore, the very ground whereby it has established its system of production and appropriation is cut from under the feet of the bourgeoisie. It produces, above all, its own grave-diggers. Its downfall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.

II.

Proletarians and Communists

In what relation do the Communists stand to the proletarians as a whole?

The Communists are no separate party distinct from other working-class parties.

They have no interests separate from the interests of the proletariat in general.

They set up no sectarian principles on which they wish to model the proletarian movement.

The Communists are only distinguished from other proletarian parties by this; that in the different national struggles of the proletarians they point out and bring to the fore the common interests of the proletariat independent of nationality; and, again, that in the different evolutionary stages which the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie must pass through, they represent always the interests of the movement as a whole.

Thus the Communists are, practically, the most progressive and resolute section of the working class of all countries; they have, theoretically, the advantage over the great mass of the proletariat of understanding the conditions and general results of the proletarian movement.

The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties: organisation of the proletariat on a class basis; overthrow of the supremacy of the bourgeois; conquest of political power by the proletariat.

The theoretical propositions of the Communists in no way rest upon ideas or principles invented or discovered by this or that universal reformer.

They are but the general expression of actual conditions of an existing class struggle, of a historical movement going on under our own eyes The

abolition of hitherto existing property relations is not a distinctive feature of Communism.

All property relations have undergone continual historic change corresponding to the change in historic social conditions.

The French Revolution, for example, abolished feudal property in favour of bourgeois property.

Thus the distinctive feature of Communism is not the abolition of property in general, but the abolition of bourgeois property.

But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most perfect expression of the system of producing and appropriating products based on class antagonism, on the exploitation of one by another.

In this sense the Communists can condense their theory into one sentence: abolition of private property.

We Communists have been reproached with wishing to abolish personal property acquired by labour; property which is alleged to be the foundation of all personal freedom, activity and independence.

Hard-won, self-earned, self-acquired property! Do you mean the property of the small tradesman and peasant, which preceded the bourgeois form of property? We have no need to abolish that; the development of industry has abolished, and is abolishing it daily.

Or do you mean modern bourgeois private property?

Does wage-labour, the labour of the proletarian, create any property for him? Not at all. It creates capital, *i.e.*, the property which exploits wage-labour, and which can increase only by producing a new supply of wage-labour for further exploitation. Property, in its present form, is based on the antagonism of capital and wage-labour. Let us examine both sides of that antagonism.

To be a capitalist is to have not only a merely personal, but a social position in production. Capital is a collective product, and can only be set in motion by the united action of many members of society, and even, in the last resort, by the united action of all its members.

Thus capital is not a personal, but a social power.

When, therefore, capital is converted into common property, belonging to all members of society, personal property is not thereby converted into ocial property. It is only the social character of the property that is changed. It loses its class character.

We come now to wage-labour.

The average price of wage-labour is the minimum wage, *i.e.*, the sum of the necessaries of life absolutely needful to keep the worker in life as a worker. Thus what the wage-earner appropriates by his labour is just so much as is necessary to assure to him a bare existence. We by no means wish to abolish this personal appropriation of the product of labour, an appropriation indispensable to the maintenance and reproduction of human life, an appropriation leaving no surplus which could give power over the labour of others. We wish only to suppress the miserable character of this appropriation, by which the

worker only lives in order to increase capital, and only lives so long as the interests of the ruling class demand it.

In bourgeois society living labour is but a means of increasing accumulated labour. In communist society accumulated labour is but a means of enlarging, enriching, and promoting the existence of the labourer.

Thus in bourgeois society the past dominates the present; in communist society the present dominates the past. In bourgeois society capital is independent and personal, whilst the living individual is dependent and deprived of personality.

And the bourgeoisie calls the abolition of this state of things the abolition of individuality and freedom! And with reason. It certainly means the abolition of bourgeois individuality, independence, and freedom.

By freedom, under the present bourgeois conditions of production, is meant free trade, free buying and selling.

But if trade disappears, free trade disappears also. All the talk of free trade, like all the rest of the freedom-bravado of our bourgeoisie, has meaning only by contrast with restricted trade, by contrast with the fettered burghers of the Middle Ages, but none when contrasted with the communistic abolition of trade, bourgeois conditions of production, and the bourgeoisie itself.

You are horrified because we would abolish private property. But in your existing society private property is already abolished for nine-tenths of the population; the essential for its existence is that it shall not exist for these nine-tenths. Thus you reproach us with desiring to abolish a form of property the necessary condition of whose existence is that the great majority of society shall be entirely propertyless.

In one word, you reproach us because we would abolish your property. Precisely so; that is our intention.

From the moment when labour can no longer be converted into capital, money, rent—briefly, into a social power capable of being monopolised, *i.e.*, from the moment when individual property can no longer be converted into bourgeois property, into capital, from that moment you declare the individual is suppressed.

You confess, therefore, that by "individual" you merely mean bourgeois, the bourgeois owner of property. And this individual must certainly be abolished.

Communism deprives none of the power to appropriate his social product, it only deprives him of the power to subjugate the labour of others by this appropriation.

It has been objected that upon the abolition of private property all activity will cease and society be plunged in universal laziness.

If that were so, bourgeois society would have been ruined long since by idleness; for those who work therein gain nothing, and those who gain do not work. The whole objection merely expresses the tautology that there can be no more wage-labour so soon as there is no more capital.

All objections urged against the communistic mode of production and

appropriation of the material product have equally been urged against its mode of producing and appropriating intellectual products. Just as, for the bourgeoisie, the disappearance of class-property is the disappearance of production itself, so, for him, the disappearance of class culture means the disappearance of culture altogether.

That culture, whose loss he deplores, is for the enormous majority merely a culture towards functioning as a machine.

But do not dispute with us so long as you apply to the abolition of bourgeois property the standard of your bourgeois ideas of freedom, culture, justice, etc. Your very ideas themselves are but products of bourgeois conditions of production and property, as your justice is but the will of your class uplifted into law; a will whose character is determined by the material conditions of existence of your class.

You share with every previous ruling class the interested conception which causes you to transform into eternal laws of nature and reason the social relations which result from your historically changing relations of production and property. What you perceive in the case of ancient property, what you perceive in the case of feudal property, you dare not admit in the case of bourgeois property.

Abolition of the family! Even the most radical are enraged by this scandalous proposal of the Communists.

On what is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its fully developed form it exists only for the bourgeoisie; but it finds its complement in the destruction of family life for the proletariat, and in public prostitution.

The bourgeois family vanishes naturally when its complement vanishes, and both disappear with the disappearance of capital.

Do you reproach us with wishing to stop the exploitation of children by their parents? We confess to this crime.

But, you say, we would destroy the most sacred of relations by replacing home education by social.

And is not your education conditioned by society? By the social conditions under which you educate, by direct or indirect social intervention, by means of schools, etc? The Communists have not invented this interference of society in education; they would merely alter its character, and rescue education from the influence of the ruling class.

The bourgeois declamations about the family and education, about the sacred relations of parents and children, become all the more disgusting as the development of Modern Industry tears asunder all family ties for the proletarians and transforms their children into mere commodities and instruments of labour.

But you Communists would introduce community of women, shrieks the whole bourgeoisie in chorus.

The bourgeois sees in his wife a mere instrument of production. He hears that the instruments of production are to become common property, and

naturally can only think that the lot of becoming common property will likewise fall to women.

He never suspects that the real point aimed at is to do away with the position of women as mere instruments of production.

For the rest, nothing is more ridiculous than the virtuous horror of our bourgeois at the community of women which he pretends will be officially established by the Communists. The Communists have no need to introduce community of women; it has nearly always existed.

The members of our bourgeoisie, not content with having the wives and daughters of their proletarians at their disposal, not to speak of official prostitution, take special delight in mutually seducing each other's wives.

Bourgeois marriage is in reality community of wives. The Communists could at most be accused of wishing to replace a hypocritical and concealed community of women by an official and open community of women. For the rest, it is evident that with the abolition of the present system of production will disappear also the community of women resulting from it, *i.e.*, public prostitution.

The Communists are further accused of wishing to abolish countries and national spirit.

The workers have no country. What they have not got cannot be taken from them. Since the proletariat must first conquer political power, must rise to be the dominant class of the nation, must constitute itself as the nation, it is so far national itself, though not at all in the bourgeois sense.

National differences and antagonisms are to-day vanishing ever more and more with the development of the bourgeoisie, free trade, the world market, the uniformity of industrial production and the conditions of life corresponding thereto.

With the victory of the proletariat they will vanish still faster. United action, of civilised countries at least, is one of the first conditions of the emancipation of the workers.

In the same measure as the exploitation of one individual by another is ended, the exploitation of one nation by another will be ended also.

With the disappearance of classes within the nation the state of enmity between nations will come to an end.

The accusations which are made against Communism from a religious, philosophical, and generally idealogical standpoint, deserve no very serious examination.

Does it require deep insight to understand that with changes in man's material conditions of life, social relations and social system, his ideas, views, and conceptions, in one word his consciousness, also changes?

What does the history of ideas prove but that intellectual production changes with material production? The ruling ideas of any particular age have ever been only the ideas of its ruling class.

When people speak of ideas that revolutionise society, the fact is merely expressed that within the old society the elements of the new are formed,

that the dissolution of the old ideas keeps pace with the dissolution of the old social relations.

When the ancient world was in its decline the ancient religions were overcome by the Christian religion. When, in the eighteenth century, Christian ideas gave place to rationalist ideas, feudal society fought its death battle with the then revolutionary bourgeoisie. The ideas of religious liberty, and liberty of conscience, merely expressed the rule of free competition within the domain of knowledge.

"Undoubtedly," it will be said, "religious, moral, philosophical, political, and juridical ideas have been modified in the course of historical development. But amid these changes religion, morals, philosophy, politics, and law remained.

"There are, moreover, eternal truths, such as freedom, justice, etc., which are common to all social systems. But Communism abolishes these eternal truths; it abolishes religion and morality instead of constituting them on a new basis, which is contrary to all past historical development."

What does this accusation amount to? The history of all past society is the history of class antagonisms, which took different forms in different epochs.

But whatever form they may have taken, the exploitation of one section of society by another is a fact common to all previous centuries. No wonder then that the social consciousness of all centuries, despite multiplicity and diversity, always moved in certain common forms, in lines of thought which can only completely vanish with the entire disappearance of class antagonism.

The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that in the course of its development it breaks most radically with traditional ideas.

But let us leave bourgeois objections to Communism.

We have already seen that the first step in the working class revolution is the raising of the proletariat to the position of ruling class, the victory of Democracy.

The proletariat will use its political power to wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, *i.e.*, of the proletariat organised as the ruling class, and to increase as rapidly as possible the total mass of productive forces.

This, naturally, cannot be accomplished at first except by despotic inroads on the rights of property and on the bourgeois conditions of production; by measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which in the course of the movement outstrip themselves, and are indispensable as means of revolutionising the whole mode of production.

These measures will naturally be different, in different countries.

Nevertheless, for the most advanced countries, the following will be pretty generally applicable:—

1. Abolition of property in land and confiscation of ground rents to the State.
2. A heavily progressive income tax.

3. Abolition of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralisation of the means of transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of national factories and instruments of production, cultivation and improvement of waste lands in accordance with a general social plan.
8. Obligation of all to labour; organisation of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agricultural and industrial labour, in order to remove the distinction between town and country.
10. Free public education for all children. Abolition of factory labour for children in its present form. Combination of education with material production, etc.

When in the course of development class distinctions have disappeared, and all production is concentrated in the hands of associated individuals, the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly speaking, is the organised power of one class for the purpose of oppressing another. If the proletariat, forced in its struggle against the bourgeoisie to organise as a class, makes itself by a revolution the ruling class, and as the ruling class destroys by force the old conditions of production, it destroys along with these conditions of production the conditions of existence of class antagonism, classes in general, and, therewith, its own domination as a class.

In the place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, an association appears in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.

III.

Socialist and Communist Literature.

1. Reactionary Socialism

(*a*) *Feudal Socialism.*—The French and English aristocracy were led by their historical position to write pamphlets against modern bourgeois society. In the French revolution of 1830, and in the English reform movement, they succumbed again to the hated upstart. A serious political contest was thenceforth out of the question. A literary battle alone remained possible. But even in the domain of literature the old cries of the restoration period had become impossible. To arouse sympathy the aristocracy must appear to lose sight of its own interests, and to formulate its indictment against the bourgeoisie in the interests of the exploited working class alone. It prepared for vengeance by singing lampoons on its new master, and by whispering in his ear sinister prophecies of impending ruin.

In this manner arose feudal socialism, a mixture of lamentation, pasquinades, echoes of the past and menaces of the future—by its witty and lacerating

criticism striking the bourgeoisie to the very heart, but yet remaining ridiculous through its total incapacity to understand the march of modern history.

As their banner the aristocrats waved aloft the alms-bag of the proletariat in order to rally the people around them. But as often as the working class joined them it caught sight on their hindquarters of the old feudal escutcheon and dispersed with loud and irreverent laughter.

One section of the French Legitimists and "Young England" presented this spectacle at its best.

When the feudalists point out that their method of exploitation was different from bourgeois exploitation they only forget that they exploited under circumstances and conditions that were quite different, and are now superannuated. When they point out that the modern proletariat did not exist under their rule, they only forget that the modern bourgeoisie was a necessary offspring of their own social system.

For the rest, they conceal so little the reactionary character of their criticism that their chief accusation against the bourgeoisie is precisely that under its *régime* is developed a class which will shatter to pieces the old social system.

They upbraid the bourgeoisie, not so much for having created a proletariat, as for having created a revolutionary proletariat.

In political practice, therefore, they join in all coercive measures against the working class, and in ordinary life they stoop, in spite of all their vapoury phrases, to pick up the golden apples dropped from the tree of industry, and to barter truth, love, and honour for traffic in wool, beetroot-sugar, and spirits.

As the parson has ever gone hand in hand with the landlord, so has clerical socialism gone hand in hand with feudal socialism.

Nothing is easier than to give Christian asceticism a socialist veneer. Has not Christianity also declaimed against private property, against marriage, against the State? In their place has it not preached charity, celibacy, mortification of the flesh, monasticism, and the church? Christian Socialism is but the Holy Water with which the priest consecrates the envy of the aristocrat.

(*b*) *Middle Class Socialism.*—The feudal aristocracy is not the only class that has been ruined by the bourgeoisie, and whose conditions of life starved and perished in modern bourgeois society. The medieval burghers and the peasant proprietors were the precursors of the modern bourgeoisie. In the countries in which industry and commerce are but little developed this class still vegetates alongside the rising bourgeoisie.

In countries where modern civilisation is developed, a new middle class has arisen, fluctuating between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and ever renewing itself as a supplementary section of bourgeois society; but its individual members are constantly hurled down by competition into the proletariat, and, moreover, with the development of modern industry they see the hour approach when they will completely disappear as an independent section

of modern society, and be replaced in commerce, manufacture, and agriculture by overseers and stewards.

In countries like France, where the peasants form much more than half the population, it was natural that writers who sided with the proletariat against the bourgeoisie should take, in their criticism of the bourgeois *régime*, the standard of the little middle class and peasant proprietors, and champion the working class from the standpoint of the petty-bourgeoisie. Thus middle class socialism arose. Sismondi was the head of this school, not only in France, but in England also.

This socialism analysed with great acuteness the contradictions inherent in modern conditions of production. It laid bare the hypocritical apologies of the economists. It proved incontrovertibly the disastrous effects of machinery and the division of labour, the concentration of capital and property in land, over-production, crises, the inevitable ruin of the lower middle class and peasantry, the misery of the proletariat, the anarchy in production, the crying disproportion in the distribution of wealth, the industrial war of extermination between nations, the dissolution of old customs, of the old family relations, of the old nationalities.

The positive aim, however, of this kind of socialism is to re-establish the old means of production and exchange, and with them the old property relations and the old form of society; or else it aims at cramping the modern means of production and exchange within the framework of the old property relations, which have been shattered by those means as they were bound to be. In either case it is both reactionary and utopian.

Corporate gilds for manufacture, patriarchal relations in agriculture—that is its last word.

In its further development it succumbed to a miserable fit of melancholia.

(*c*) *German or "True" Socialism.*—The Socialist and Communist literature in France, which originated under the pressure of a ruling bourgeoisie and was the literary expression of the battle against that rule, was introduced into Germany at a time when the bourgeoisie there had just begun its struggle against feudal absolutism.

German philosophers, quasi-philosophers, and "fine writers" eagerly seized on this literature, only forgetting that with the importation of these writings from France, French social conditions had not likewise been imported. In contact with German social conditions the French literature lost all its immediate practical significance and took on a purely literary character. It appeared merely as an idle speculation on the perfectibility of human nature. Thus to the German philosophers of the eighteenth century the demands of the first French Revolution were nothing more than the demands of "Practical Reason" in general, and the manifestation of the will of the revolutionary French bourgeoisie signified in their eyes the laws of pure will, of necessary will, of true human will.

The work of the German *literati* consisted exclusively in bringing the new French ideas into harmony with their philosophical conscience, or rather in

appropriating the French ideas and accommodating them to their own philosophical point of view.

This appropriation took place in the same way in which a foreign language is appropriated—by translation.

It is well known how the monks wrote *over* the classical works of pagan authors the absurd tales of catholic saints. The German *literati* reversed this process with the profane French literature. They wrote their philosophical rubbish *beneath* the French original. For instance, beneath the French criticism of the functions of money they wrote "Alienation of the Human Entity"; beneath the French criticism of the bourgeois State they wrote "Elimination of the Supremacy of the Abstract Universal," etc.

The introduction of this philosophical phraseology under the French historical criticisms they christened "Philosophy of Action," "True Socialism," "German Science of Socialism," "Philosophical Basis of Socialism," etc.

The French socialist-communistic literature was thus completely emasculated. And because it ceased in the hands of the Germans to express the struggle of one class against another, the Germans thought they had overcome "French one-sidedness," and that they had defended, instead of true needs "the needs of Truth," and instead of the interests of the proletarians the interests of Human Nature, of Mankind in general—Man, who has no class, and no reality, except in the shadowy realms of philosophical phantasy.

This German socialism, which took its schoolboy task so seriously and solemnly and extolled it in such charlatan fashion, nevertheless lost little by little its pedantic innocence.

The struggle of the German, especially of the Prussian, bourgeoisie against feudalism and absolute monarchy, in one word, the liberal movement, became more earnest. By this "True" socialism was offered the much desired opportunity of confronting the political movement with the socialist demands, of hurling the traditional anathemas against liberalism, against representative government, against bourgeois competition, bourgeois freedom of the press, bourgeois law, bourgeois liberty and equality, and of preaching to the masses that they had nothing to gain, but, on the contrary, everything to lose by this bourgeois movement. German socialism forgot, very conveniently, that the French criticism, whose foolish echo it was, presupposed modern bourgeois society with its corresponding conditions of existence and the political constitution adapted thereto—precisely the things whose attainment had yet to be fought for in Germany.

It served the absolute governments, with their following of priests, pedagogues, country squires and officials, as a welcome scarecrow against the threatening advance of the bourgeoisie.

It was a sweet complement to the bitter floggings and bullets which these same governments administered to the rebellious working class of Germany.

While "True" socialism served as a weapon in the hand of the government against the German bourgeoisie, it also directly represented a reactionary interest—the interest of the German middle class. In Germany the little

middle class, transmitted from the sixteenth century, and since then constantly reappearing under various forms, is the real social basis of the existing state of things.

Its preservation implies the preservation of the existing state of things in Germany. The industrial and political supremacy of the bourgeoisie threatens it with certain destruction, on the one hand, from the concentration of capital, on the other hand, from the rise of a revolutionary proletariat. "True" socialism appeared to kill both birds with one stone. It spread like an epidemic.

The garment, woven of speculative cobwebs, embroidered with flowers of rhetoric and saturated with the dews of sickly sentiment, this transcendental garment in which the German socialists enveloped their pitifully emaciated "eternal truths," only served to increase the sale of their goods to the public.

On its side German socialism recognised more and more its own vocation as the pompous representative of the petty-bourgeoisie.

It proclaimed the German nation to be the model nation, and the German petty-bourgeoisie to be the Normal Man. It gave to each baseness of the latter an occult, superior, socialistic meaning, the exact contrary of its true character. It went to the extreme length of directly opposing the "brutally destructive" tendency of Communism, and of declaring its impartial and lofty superiority to all class struggles. With very few exceptions all that is circulated as socialist and communist writing in Germany belongs to this foul and enervating literature.

2. CONSERVATIVE OR BOURGEOIS SOCIALISM.

One section of the bourgeoisie desires to redress social grievances in order to secure the continuance of bourgeois society.

To this section belong: economists, philanthropists, humanitarians, reformers of working class conditions, charity organisers, temperance fanatics, and all the motley variety of reformers of every description. And this bourgeois socialism has been elaborated into complete systems.

We may cite as an example Proudhon's *Philosophie de la Misère*.

The bourgeois socialists want to have the conditions of life of modern society without the necessarily resulting struggles and dangers. They want the existing state of society with the elimination of its revolutionary and disintegrating elements. They want the bourgeoisie without the proletariat. The bourgeoisie naturally regards the world in which it rules as the best world. Bourgeois socialism elaborates this comforting conception into systems more or less complete. When it summons the proletariat to realise its system and to enter the New Jerusalem, it only requires in reality that the proletariat should remain in existing social conditions, but should cast away its hateful ideas about those conditions.

A second, more practical, but less systematic form of this socialism, sought to disgust the working class with every revolutionary movement by showing that not this or that political reform, but only a change in the material conditions of existence, in economic relations, could be of any benefit. By a change

in the material conditions of life this form of socialism by no means refers to a change in bourgeois relations of production, for which a revolution is necessary, but to administrative reforms carried out on the basis of these relations of production, thus leaving unaltered the relations of capital and wage-labour, and, at best, merely lessening the cost of government for the bourgeoisie and simplifying its administrative work.

Bourgeois socialism only attains adequate expression when it becomes a mere figure of rhetoric.

Free trade—in the interest of the working class! Protection—in the interest of the working class! Prison reform—in the interest of the working class! That is the last and only serious word of bourgeois socialism.

The socialism of the bourgeoisie is summed up in the phrase: the bourgeois is a bourgeois—in the interest of the working class.

3. CRITICAL-UTOPIAN SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM.

We do not here refer to that literature which, in all great modern revolutions, has expressed the demands of the proletariat (the writings of Baboeuf, etc.).

The first direct efforts of the proletariat to attain its own ends, made in times of general agitation in the period of the overthrow of feudal society, necessarily failed, owing as much to the undeveloped state of the proletariat itself as to the absence of the economic conditions for its emancipation, which conditions could only be the product of the bourgeois epoch. The revolutionary literature which accompanied these first movements of the proletariat was necessarily reactionary in character. It preached universal asceticism and a crude levelling process.

The genuine Socialist and Communist systems, the systems of St. Simon, Fourier, Owen, etc., sprang up during the early undeveloped period of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie which we have described above. (See *Bourgeoisie and Proletariat.*)

The founders of these systems perceive indeed the class antagonism as well as the action of the decomposing elements in the prevailing form of society. But on the side of the proletariat they can find no historical initiative and no independent political movement.

Since the development of class antagonism keeps pace with the development of industry, they find none of the material conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat, and therefore search after a social science, social laws, in order to create these conditions.

Social activity is to be replaced by their personal inventive activity; historical conditions of emancipation to be replaced by fantastical conditions; the gradual and spontaneous organisation of the proletariat as a class is to be replaced by an organisation of society specially invented by themselves. The future history of the world becomes for them, the propaganda and practical application of their social plans.

In the formation of their plans they are conscious, above all, of defending the interests of the working class as being the most suffering class. Only under this aspect of being the most suffering class does the proletariat exist for them.

The undeveloped state of the class struggle, as well as their own social position, cause them to fancy themselves far superior to all class antagonisms. They want to improve the conditions of all members of society, even the most favoured.

Hence they appeal continually to the whole of society without distinction, and even by preference to the ruling class. For how can anyone who understands their system fail to recognise in it the best possible plan of the best possible society?

They therefore reject all political, and especially all revolutionary action; they wish to attain their ends by peaceful means, and endeavour by small experiments, necessarily foredoomed to failure, and by the force of example, to prepare the way for the new social gospel.

This fantastic picture of future society, painted at a time when the proletariat was still but little developed and had but a fantastical conception of its own position, corresponds to the first instinctive aspirations of the workers towards a complete transformation of society.

But these socialist and communist writings also contain a critical element. They attacked society at its very basis. Thus they provided the most valuable materials for the enlightenment of the working class. Their positive propositions as to future society, *e.g.*, the abolition of the distinction between town and country, the family, private gain, wage-labour, the proclamation of social harmony, the conversion of the State into a mere machine for the administration of production—all these propositions merely indicate the disappearance of that class antagonism that had then only just begun to develop, and which they only knew as yet in its first indistinct and undefined forms. These proposals are, therefore, of a purely utopian character.

The significance of Critical Utopian Socialism and Communism is in inverse proportion to historical development. In proportion as the class struggle develops and takes shape, this fantastic disdain of the struggle, these fantastic attacks upon it, lose all practical value and all theoretical justification. Therefore, while the founders of this system were revolutionary in many respects, their disciples form mere reactionary sects. They hold fast by the old views of their masters in opposition to the historical evolution of the proletariat. Thus they consistently endeavour to suppress the class struggle and to reconcile antagonisms. They ever dream of the experimental realisation of their social utopia, of establishing isolated "Phalanstères," of founding home colonies, of setting up little "Icarias,"[1] duodecimo editions of the New Jerusalem—and to realise all these castles in the air they are forced to appeal to the philanthropy of the bourgeois hearts and purses. By degrees they fall into the category of the reactionary or conservative socialists, described

[1] Owen called his communistic model societies "Home-Colonies." *Phalanstères* was the name given by Fourier to his plan of social palaces. The utopian fantasy by which Cabet described his communistic institutions, was called *Icaria*.

above, and are only distinguished from these by their more systematic pedantry and by their fanatical and superstitious belief in the miraculous power of their social science.

They therefore bitterly oppose all political action of the working class, which could only result from a blind unbelief in their new gospel.

The Owenites in England and the Fourierists in France respectively oppose the Chartists and the "Reformists."

IV.

Position of the Communists in Relation to the Various Opposition Parties.

The relation of the Communists to the existing working class parties is explained in Section II., which includes their relations to the Chartists in England and the Agrarian Reformers in America.

They fight for the attainment of the immediate and momentary aims and interests of the working class, but in the movement of the present they also defend the future of that movement. In France the Communists ally themselves with the Social Democratic Party[1] against the conservative and radical bourgeoisie, reserving however the right to criticise the phrases and illusions handed down by the revolutionary tradition.

In Switzerland they support the radicals, without forgetting that this party consists of contradictory elements, half being democratic socialists in the French sense, and half radical bourgeois.

In Poland the Communists support the party that sees in an agrarian revolution the means to national freedom, that party which caused the insurrection of Cracow in 1846.

In Germany the Communist Party fights with the bourgeoisie whenever it acts in a revolutionary manner against the absolute monarchy, the feudal landlords, and the little middle class.

But the Communists never cease for one moment to instil into the workers the clearest possible recognition of the antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat, in order that the German workers may use the social and political conditions necessarily created by the bourgeois rule as weapons against the bourgeoisie, and in order that after the fall of the reactionary classes in Germany the fight against the bourgeoisie itself may begin immediately.

The Communists turn their attention chiefly to Germany, because Germany is on the eve of a bourgeois revolution, and because this revolution will be carried out under the most advanced conditions of European civilisation and with a much more developed proletariat than that of England in the seventeenth and France in the eighteenth centuries; the German bourgeois revolution, consequently, can only be the immediate prelude to a proletarian revolution.

In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.

[1] Of Ledru-Rollin. See page 180.

In all these movements they bring the property question to the front as the fundamental question of the movement, no matter what its particular degree of development may be.

Finally, the Communists work everywhere for the union and agreement of the democratic parties of all countries.

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can only be attained by the forcible overthrow of existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.

WORKERS OF ALL LANDS, UNITE!

Section I

France 1848-1851

68	Louis Blanc: *Organisation of Labour.* Conclusion	1839
69	Ledru-Rollin: Election Address, July	1841
70-72	Proclamations of Provisional Governments, February 24	1848
73-76	Decrees of February 25	1848
77	L. A. Blanqui: Speech on February 26	1848
78	Decree Instituting National Workshops, February 28	1848
79	Gloveworkers' Election Placard to the Luxembourg, March	1848
80	A. de Lamartine: *Manifesto to Europe,* March 2	1848
81	Decree Abolishing Sub-Contracting, March 2	1848
82	E. Thomas: Proposals on National Workshops to the Government on March 5	1848
83	Committee of the Luxembourg Assembly, March 10	1848
84	Louis Blanc: Programme Outlined on March 20	1848
85	E. Thomas: Conversations with M. Marie, March 20-28	1848
86-87	Conciliation Awards of the Luxembourg (*Plumbers and Paviors*)	1848
88	Election Placard of the Luxembourg, April	1848
89	E. Thomas: Workshop Regulations, April	1848
90	A. Barbès: Placard Concerning Rouen Massacres, April 29	1848
91	Documents Prepared for Issue on May 15: (A) Provisional Government; (B) Seven Decrees	1848
92	Decrees Actually Issued on May 15	1848
93	Decree on the Workshops, Prepared for May 24, Issued June 21	1848
94	Louis Pujol: *Prophecy of Days of Blood,* June	1848
95	Luxembourg and Workshops: Joint Placard, June 18	1848
96	Insurgents' Proclamations, June 26	1848
97-100	Proclamations and Facts of the June Revolt	1848
101	Ledru-Rollin: On Family and Property, August 25	1848
102	L. A. Blanqui: Extracts from the *Critique Sociale*	1869

Introduction

IN the winter of 1847 occurred the first large International financial crisis. Britain, being incontestably the most advanced industrial country, had previously suffered alone.[1] This time Paris, Frankfort and Vienna were seriously shaken—Paris worst of all. France, during the reign of Louis Philippe, had advanced to the second position among European industrial countries. A very great expansion of textile manufacture, especially in the North, had been accompanied by advancement in other spheres and by the usual reckless gambling. At the end of 1847, it was reckoned that of the 15,000 million francs in circulation in France, 2,500 millions were in coin, 400 millions in banknotes, and the rest, being about 12,000 millions, in bills of exchange, which became largely waste paper when the crisis broke out. Such a proportion was at that time amazing. This expansion of industry and credit was, of course, producing the dreadful effects upon the workers that were apparent in England also. M. Renard (*Histoire Socialiste* IX, p. 314) mentions that in 1836 Paris counted, out of every 1,232 people, 100 below the poverty line, while nine out of every twenty-four deaths were in the *hospice*. The impression produced on a bourgeois mind is vividly shown in Ledru-Rollin's election address of 1841 (No. 69), and there are many appalling facts in Louis Blanc's *Organisation of Labour*. In addition to this, the Revolution was preceded by an actual famine. In 1847, the price of corn rose to 29 fr. 50 per hectolitre; in 1848 it had fallen again to 16.27, and in 1850 to 14.33. Wine had risen to 40 fr. 85 per hectolitre in 1847; in 1848 it fell back to 28.45. This had its natural effect on the working classes; in Paris, in the winter of 1847, *one-third* of the population was in receipt of charity and 450,000 persons received food tickets. The only person who profited was the peasant, and the Revolution, therefore, barely excited his interest. Indeed, the fact that soon after its outbreak a fall in the price of corn occurred may have had something to do with his hostility.

On top of this came a commercial crash. On February 24 the Bank of France had 200 million fr. gold reserve. On March 15, 108 millions—45 belonging to the Government and only 14 available in Paris. A moratorium was twice renewed. The crisis continued right down to the days of June. For example, as late as July, in Tourcoing, eight workers out of twelve were unemployed; in Calais, nine out of twelve; in Montreuil nine out of seventeen; St. Etienne, two-thirds of the workers were unemployed, etc., etc. An interesting indication is given by the numbers of the industrial patents issued: 1847, 2,150; 1848, 853; 1849, 1,477. After June, credit recovered itself, grew steadily better through 1849, while 1850 was a year of great prosperity.

So much for those who would see in the Revolution of 1848 a purely political phenomenon. To turn to the political history.

[1] See H M Hyndman: *Commercial Crises of the XIXth Century*, Chap. 4.

The suffrage under Louis Philippe was confined to the very richest of the bourgeoisie.[1] The small, and even the moderately wealthy, bourgeoisie were excluded. Consequently, the Liberal opposition, led by Odilon Barrot, relied to a certain extent upon non-voters for moral support. In the winter of 1847-1848, their continued exclusion from power and the reactionary policy of the Ministry of Guizot drove them to undertake a noisy electoral campaign by means of banquets. Banquets were held all over France, to which many members of the lower orders were admitted; some parliamentary leader would deliver a speech upon Liberal principles, and be loudly applauded. The Opposition was merely occupied in a singularly noisy electoral campaign, in which they made the violent and meaningless speeches natural to politicians. Believing themselves alone to be the real popular force, they ignored or ridiculed the steady Republican and Socialist propaganda of Ledru-Rollin and Louis Blanc; and, so far as they could see, their chances of success seemed very great. Indeed, so greatly did they annoy the existing Ministry, that Guizot forbade the holding of a banquet in Paris on February 22. The day arrived; M. Barrot and his friends, as was to be expected, did not turn up. But the people of Paris had been worked up to a great enthusiasm and remained surging in the streets all day. In the evening, a party of soldiers fired on some demonstrators; instantly Paris was in an uproar; barricades were thrown up and the Municipal guard was attacked on every side. No one cared to defend the King; small bourgeois, landowner, and worker had all suffered under his régime, and the terrible financial crisis had removed his last supporter, the big financier. The defence was weak, by the morning of the 24th victory was won: the King had abdicated and fled.

Karl Marx[2] remarks that history reproduces itself—once as tragedy, once as farce—and that whereas in 1789-93 we perceive the victorious advance of the people, in 1848 we perceive the undignified backward retreat of the forces of progress, while all the time the actors hide themselves under the names and gestures of the men of '93. Blanqui aspires to be a Marat, Barbès to be a Robespierre, the measliest Republican sheet calls itself the *Père Duchêne*, and the whole movement ends in a comic-opera imitation of the great Napoleon. In spite, however, of its inglorious end, and of its use of the terms and names of 1793, the Revolution of 1848 has an individual character and an abiding importance. In all these struggles, which have such a depressing ending, we can see clearly reflected the class war.

The Revolution may be divided into three periods. The first extends down to June 27, 1848. It is the period of the defeat of the working-class, which began almost with their victory on the barricades.

On February 24, no one was more appalled than the Opposition at the flight of the King. They were busily arranging for a Regency when the revolutionaries burst into the Chamber of Deputies and insistently demanded a Provisional Government. The deputies mostly fled: one of the Left, Lamartine, read out a list which consisted, except for one name (Ledru-

[1] 190,000 voters out of a possible 9,000,000.
[2] *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, p. 1.

Rollin), entirely of Liberal parliamentarians (No. 71). Dissent and annoyance were expressed, but for the most part the workers were certain of their victory and neither knew nor cared who exactly were the members of the Government, so long as the King and the Chamber were gone. Meanwhile, the real leaders of the insurrection, the Socialists and Radicals, collected at the offices of the *Réforme* newspaper, had proclaimed another government (No. 70),[1] which, while it did not exclude the propertied classes, gave due preponderance to the real revolutionaries—the workers. Their nominees, Caussidière, Sobrier, and E. Arago, took charge at once of the Prefecture of Police and the Post Office; and if they had pressed their right no doubt this essentially democratic government could have eliminated the other.[2] Yet when a deputation of four of them arrived at the Hotel de Ville and found Lamartine's government in possession, its servility to parliamentary institutions was such that it actually withdrew its pretensions and the four members became secretaries to the Government (No. 72). Very soon, when they realised their folly, they insisted on being made full members of the Government, while Caussidière and Sobrier remained at the Prefecture of Police. Nevertheless, the harm was done, and the anti-Socialist Liberal party had a majority in the Government.

For the minute, however, this seemed not to matter. Every historian speaks feelingly of the amazing concord of the first few days of the Revolution; of the simple joy of singing the *Marseillaise* at street corners; of the processions, and embraces of worker and employer; of Baron Rothschild and his fellows opening a huge subscription to reward and recompense the workers who had been wounded fighting on the 23rd, etc. And it is true that in the few days following the success of February the Government issued a series of decrees very greatly to the benefit of the workers (Nos. 73-76.)

But during a very severe commercial crisis, when unemployment is rife and strikes frequent, such unity could hardly continue for long. The Socialists had soon to review their forces. Inside the Government they had two representatives, Louis Blanc and Albert. They could also rely on the occasional support of the *petit bourgeois* democrats, Flocon and Ledru-Rollin. Crémieux, the Jew Minister of Justice, was in reality a supporter of the upper bourgeoisie, but being a man of generous instincts, he was not infrequently to be found on any given point on the side of the minority. Later, he became a Bonapartist. The rest—Dupont, Lamartine, Garnier Pagès, Fr. Arago, Marie and Marrast, together with the Secretary, Pagnerre—were all representatives of the upper bourgeoisie. They were anti-Socialists and suspicious of the Revolution, which they had neither anticipated nor desired. They hoped, not unjustifiably, to turn it to the profit of their own class.

But in comparison with the rest of the established governments of Europe they were Liberal, even revolutionary. They were not lacking in a certain well-meant enthusiasm for the common devices of Liberalism and a genuine

[1] Previously, apparently, the men of the *National* (Liberal) and *Réforme* (Radical) had come to some sort of agreement about a Provisional Government. But the matter is very obscure.

[2] An attempt by one Captain Jourdan to form a government at the Town Hall had simply ended in that able politician, Garnier Pagès, making himself Mayor of Paris.

desire to preserve the peace of Europe. They may best be judged by the most famous pronouncement of their most famous man, Lamartine's *Manifesto to the Powers of Europe* (No. 80).

Thus, in the government, we have one party devoid even of a programme of social reform, led by Lamartine, two Social Reformers (Ledru-Rollin and Flocon) and two Socialists. Outside, however, the Socialists were infinitely stronger—at least, in Paris.

Of the workers' organisations, the noisiest, although not the most important or the most interesting, were the clubs. These had sprung up innumerable after the revolt of February, and were led chiefly by the veterans of Revolution, such as Raspail, Blanqui, and Barbès, to mention the most important. They were inspired by the history of 1793; they modelled themselves upon the Cordeliers and the Jacobins and used the same language and similar methods. Their aims were, however, different; they were humane and more or less consciously Socialist and would certainly have been shocked if Hebert had really come back to them to voice his programme.

The first in importance was undoubtedly the Central Republican Society, of which Louis Auguste Blanqui was the President and guiding spirit. A sombre and sardonic man, Blanqui spent his life in ceaseless agitation for the working-class. In all his life he never relaxed for a moment from his fierce inflexibility.[1] His enmity to the ruling class knew no cessation. He lived for agitation and envisaged politics as a series of revolutionary *coups de main*. "Forty-eight hours," he said, "are enough to make the Revolution."

Now that his name is partly forgotten, it is good to remember that in 1871 the Commune offered to Thiers to exchange all their hostages, if he desired, for this one man, Blanqui. Thiers refused. In every movement, every revolt that occurred, the alarmed bourgeoisie saw the menacing figure of Blanqui in the background.[2] Although nearly all his life was spent in prison, although his inflexible and harsh character made him an outcast even in the Socialist ranks, yet he had but to appear, his name had but to be uttered, for a band of followers to collect. His writings are now even more forgotten, but his *Critique Sociale* was an important and valuable contribution to Socialist theory. It is, at least, totally incorrect to say that he lacked a programme or was a follower of Saint-Simon (See Nos. 77 and 102). He had a clear conception of the class war, and in this he differed from his fellow Socialist and rival, Armand Barbès, President of the Club of the Revolution. Barbès was in character a vivid contrast to Blanqui. He was gentle, conciliatory, and generally liked. His character was respected even by his worst enemies, and his personal disinterestedness and kindliness led him to believe that the needs of Labour could be satisfied by amicable agreement with the capitalist. Yet, in the matter of immediate action, he was bellicose to a degree; he dreamed continually of *coups d'état*, and, in common with Blanqui, hoped for war with the reactionary powers of Europe. In this they both resembled the Republicans

[1] The *pièce Taschereau* is, I believe, a miserable calumny.
[2] It was said that Lamartine, on the one occasion on which he interviewed him, wore a cuirass under his waistcoat.

of 1830. Barbès has left little record of his ultimate ambitions: his principles we find stated in No. 90, and perhaps the decrees of May 15 (Nos. 91-92) may be held to represent his immediate policy. But as he has left no sufficient records we are reduced to conjecture.[1] His bitter enmity to Blanqui was one of the reasons of the feeble action of the clubs at critical moments. Of other clubs far less important and more loosely knit, mention may be made of the veteran F. V. Raspail's Friends of the People and of the Central Fraternal Society, where Robert Owen and Cabet could often be heard. This last was pacific and more consciously and definitely Socialist in its ideals.

The Socialist working-class and the clubs generally were dependent for their political programme upon various sects which have now disappeared. Apart from the personal influence of Louis Blanc, which will be dealt with later, these were three in number, which quarrelled bitterly, the Saint-Simonians, the Fourierists and the Cabetists. The influence of the first has been greatly exaggerated. Saint-Simon's school was almost moribund. The banker, Olinde Rodrigues, attempted to arrange some common action by the group, but discovered that its members had chiefly become wealthy Conservatives. Hence, nothing but individual action came from this group—as, for example, the address by the Luxembourg delegate, P. Vinçard, to the Stock Exchange on the benefits of Socialism. Vinçard, must, indeed, have had the faith that moves mountains. The Fourierists and Cabetists were not organised in clubs, but linked into a group by their powerful papers—the *Démocratie Pacifique* and the *Populaire* (Cabet). They were both pacifist, and relied upon the same type of Utopian Socialism. They spent their time in worrying the Assembly for money to start a Socialist community in some corner of France, which, they believed, would serve as such an enticing example that similar communities would quickly cover all France. P. J. Proudhon had a purely personal influence, due largely to his gift for denunciation. His views at the moment were in a state of flux; in 1851 he proclaimed himself definitely an Anarchist. In a note to No. 88 is given his most useful contribution during this period.

These were, however, not the most important or most truly working-class organisations.[2] On February 28 the Provisional Government had refused to create a Ministry of Labour, but instead called together a "Commission for the Workers."[3] Its powers were vague—apparently its only duty was to prepare a scheme for the organisation of labour, since by a decree of the 25th (No. 73) the Government had promised work for all, yet on March 3 we find Blanc, as its president, signing a decree diminishing the working day in Paris by one hour. It speedily became, however, the real revolutionary force in Paris, corresponding to the Commune in 1793, and in composition was a

[1] When M. Jeanjean's *Armand Barbès* has got beyond the first volume more information may, perhaps, be available.

[2] Among the societies (which are practically Trade Unions) which sprung up about this time one of the most peculiar must have been the "Fraternal Association of Bureaucrats," whose inaugural notice is preserved in the British Museum.

[3] This was probably at the time a move by the "Moderates" to rid themselves of the Socialists, Blanc and Albert, thinking that they could do no harm away in the Luxembourg with a powerless Commission. If that was so their expectations were grievously disappointed.

forerunner of the Russian Soviet. Every trade was invited to send three delegates, who sat at the Luxembourg to the number of three or four hundred. Of the method of their election I have been able to discover little; it seems, however, that it was somewhat casual (No. 79)[1] and that Blanc trusted—probably justifiably at such a time—to the interest of the workers to induce them to turn up to elect their representative.

It was entirely dominated by the personality of Louis Blanc and his follower, the worker Albert, who were its president and vice-president respectively. Louis Blanc, member of the Provisional Government, is, indeed, the most important man of this period. An able and emotional journalist, he had been made a Socialist largely by the Lyons Revolution of 1831, when the workers' banners bore the pathetic claim "Let us live by working or die fighting." (*Vivre en travaillant ou mourir en combattant*). Of all the Socialists of that time he alone had a practical programme (No. 68).[2] Naturally, the programme issued by the Luxembourg "Socialist Parliament" bore a very considerable resemblance to Blanc's own suggestions (No. 84).

The Luxembourg Commission did not confine itself to elaborate programmes for the Government. It became also a centre of a vigorous Socialist agitation, conducted by and through the workers. When the elections approached it undertook to run what we should call Labour Party candidates for all Paris, and—more important—organised itself as a permanent committee of the working classes, representing all trades (No. 88). It also undertook to settle by amicable arrangement the continual strikes in Paris (Nos. 86, 87), and by these means succeeded in enforcing a minimum wage and various other reforms in an uncertain number of industries.[3]

Finally, it remains to note that the strike was not thought of as a weapon of revolution; indeed, the financial distress of many employers might have made such an experiment not unwelcome to them and the strike have met the fate of the Chartist strike in 1842. It should also be observed that the scientific Socialism of the Communist Manifesto had hardly reached Paris. The character of the lists of the Executive in No. 83 and in No. 88 is also interesting. In each case, though perhaps less in the latter, when more trades had become affiliated, industries essentially *small* are represented, a fact which no doubt had its effect on the plans of the Assembly.

The alarm aroused by this new power had two results in the reactionary camp. In the first place, it hastened the creation of the famous Party of Order,[4] which, composed of reactionaries of all kinds, of rigid Republicans, and, at

[1] E. Thomas (*Ateliers Nationeaux*, p. 26) asserts that out of 8,000 house carpenters about 600 only were concerned in the election of their representation, but his partisanship and bitter hatred made his statement in the last degree suspect. In any case, he gives no ground for his casual assertion which does not in any way correspond to the great influence exerted according to his own account by "the fanatic and anarchic reds of the Luxembourg."

[2] It is essential for a proper understanding of this period, that his *Organisation of Labour* should be read in full.

[3] Particularly, the abolition of sweating by sub-contracting (No. 81). It also directly founded three considerable co-operative factories—of tailors, saddlers and spinners. Other producers' co-operative societies for the first time appeared in large numbers owing to its influence, and some struggled on, in face of the general hostility and official persecution, until the fall of the empire. See the figures in E. Laveleye's *Socialism of To-day*, p. 73. Two of these societies still existed in 1907.

[4] For the minute, it called itself rather the "Tricolor Republican Party," as opposed to the "Reds" It did not take its final name until after June, when it could dispense with the pure Republicans.

first, of the small bourgeois "Jacobins," was united only to oppose Communism. It had as its three aims "Defence of Property, Religion and the Family"—it did not matter that the two latter were not attacked, any stick will do to beat a Socialist with. Later, it continually threw off its democratic and Republican elements, until, when it had destroyed them, it found itself in the hands of Napoleon III. More important, for the moment, was the creation of the National workshops (see *infra*, pp. 175-179) which, under the anti-Socialist Minister, Marie, provided a large "yellow" army of drilled workers.

The backward trend of the Revolution moved by clearly defined stages. First of all, on March 17, L. A. Blanqui inspired a tumultuous procession to interview the Government. The alarmed Ministers implored Louis Blanc to intervene. Blanc did so and had the pleasure of seeing that his eloquence and the pressure of the National Guard induced Blanqui's followers to retire discomfited. Blanc returned home delighted at his own success.[1] A month later, having discomfited his own Left wing, he suffered the same treatment. A large deputation, led by Luxembourg delegates (April 16), noisy but peaceable, was met by a huge force of National Guards and workers from the National workshops, hustled, and broken up with shouts of "Down with the Communists!" Its deputation was received and rebuked by Ledru-Rollin (Minister of the Interior), who this night returned home congratulating himself that to-day *he* had been the saviour of society. The Government had broken with the Socialists.[2]

Knowing that they had not had time to educate the people, and not being wise enough to take advantage of the *élan* of February, the Socialists, through the Luxembourg Commission, had demanded the adjournment of the elections. They were adjourned till April 23, which gave no time for Socialist propaganda to spread yet was long enough for the February enthusiasm to disappear. Consequently, the Party of Order gained a sweeping victory. It is true that in Paris, for example (according to placards) only one-eighth of the workers had been inscribed as voters.[3] But this explanation is not adequate. The real strength of the Party of Order, like the Gironde, was in the provinces. They represented the voiceless and savagely ignorant French peasant. In one case, peasants, hearing that there was a new government with Ledru-Rollin, Marie and Lamartine in it, understood this to mean that "*le duc Rollin*[4] was holding dreadful orgies in Paris with two loose women called La Marie and La Martine." They were largely subjected to the clergy, who were almost all of the Party of Order. Finally, their land not yet being deeply mortgaged, they lacked a violent spur to revolution, as in 1789.[5]

Quickly the bourgeoisie began to assure its power. On April 27, trouble

[1] This was followed by the publication on March 31 of the *pièce Taschereau*, a much-disputed document impugning Blanqui's honesty, which severely damaged his influence.
[2] This was the first occasion on which troops were brought into Paris.
[3] 20,000 out of approximately 150,000 to 200,000.
[4] Duke Rollin.
[5] Something must also be allowed for deliberate deceit. Everywhere the worst reactionaries got in by means of the most advanced programmes; people who were the agents of the Bonapartists posed as the most pure Republicans. Louis Bonaparte described himself as a Socialist. Another cause, no doubt, was the tax of 45 centimes on all landed property, which Garnier Pagès had imposed in the hope of repairing the State finances. This, naturally, hit the poor peasant very heavily.

arose in Rouen from crowds of workers, who complained that they had been deprived of their vote. The bourgeois National Guard and the troops of the line fired again and again on unarmed crowds. The affray was a pure massacre and provoked fury in Paris. Even Barbès's tone is menacing (No. 90). But the Assembly, when it met, elected Senard, the officer responsible, as its vice-president, then it interdicted the right of petition and gave its president the power to call upon the military on his own authority. The Luxembourg Commission held its last official session on May 13. Its report was not even discussed.

This provoked the first Socialist revolt. Louis Blanc left the Luxembourg on the 13th with ambiguous words. Certainly, he never intended the delegates to understand that he desired them to revolt; more probably he had no plan. Anyhow, the club leaders took matters out of his hands. On May 15 the streets were thronged by a huge unarmed crowd, which, by Caussidière's connivance, met with no obstacle from the police, and, since General Courtais would not order the National Guard to fire on them, penetrated to the Assembly. With curious infelicity the leaders had decided that it was to present a petition asking for war to restore Poland, a subject entirely alien from the realities of the class-struggle whose instruments they were. Having presented the petition and broken the Assembly's decree, Barbès desired that the crowd should retire. But Huber—alleged, perhaps wrongly, to be a police agent—brusqued things by crying out "The Assembly is dissolved!" Barbès was carried to the Hôtel de Ville by the crowd; where he issued decrees (No. 92) which show his immediate policy. Other decrees, prepared but not issued, were later found which show clearly the clubs' programme (Nos. 91A and B). Be it observed particularly that they have not even troubled to study Blanc's plan, but say (p. 209) that they will issue a decree when they have time![1]

An unarmed revolution before an armed bourgeoisie has little chance. The National Guard performed prodigies of valour in dispersing its unarmed opponents, and in less than an hour Barbès and other conspirators were under arrest. Caussidière was forced to resign his office, and Courtais dismissed. The Socialists were completely routed and Louis Blanc's influence gone.

The causes of the rising and its failure are not far to seek. The New Assembly met at a time when the industrial crisis was at its worst. The Republic seemed only to have aggravated the evil, which might plausibly, in the eyes of the French bourgeois, be put down to turbulent government and to the extortionate demands of the workers. Almost every day saw a strike in which the workers were commonly successful, since they could always enrol themselves at the National Workshops and draw strike-pay from the State. It also represented a far older antagonism, which we have once already seen in the conflict between the Gironde and the Mountain. The Assembly stood for "Federalism," that revolt of the provinces against Paris which had

[1] The list of names in Nos. 91 and 92 proves clearly, I think, that the movement was controlled by the clubs.

threatened to arrest the Revolution in 1793, and was, in fact, to destroy it in 1848. For these various reasons the Assembly had come to Paris firmly determined to suppress this disorderly proletariat and bring the Revolution back to its proper bourgeois measure. It had already signalised its opinions by omitting the Socialists from its new Government.

With such an Assembly, it was only a matter of time for the proletariat to rise in revolt. The appointment of the Rouen murderer, Senard, as a vice-president of the Assembly, the ignoring of the Luxembourg report, the suspension of the right of petition—were not these enough indications? It is, indeed, surprising that the workers failed to dissolve the Assembly. Being armed, they were, if they chose, a force fully competent to disperse the National Guard. Their defeat can only be ascribed to the club leaders. Once the crowds were upon the streets the influence of the Luxembourg delegates, never much accustomed to leadership, was gone, and the veteran club leaders took the first place. In the whole of their programme they showed the pedantry of the professional revolutionary. Sobrier—or whoever it was who arranged the revolt—insisted upon the people coming unarmed. It seems clear[1] that he felt this revolution must follow exactly the plan of others, particularly the February one: first, the people will have a great unarmed protest meeting; then they will be insulted and ignored, perhaps even shot down: then the People will rise again in its wrath and the Assembly be dissolved. Since this had happened before, it must happen again, and I imagine that it was his obsession of the revolutionary tradition that prevented him from seeing that it was impossible for him to storm the Assembly with an angry mob and yet not dissolve it. Huber may not have been a police agent, he may merely have been, as he said, over-excited.

However this may be, the results were disastrous. In 1848, the division between the proletariat and its middle-class leaders was very marked. The proletariat itself had produced no leaders except Albert, a man, apparently, of no outstanding force of character. The 15th May removed from it all its middle-class leaders. Blanqui, Barbès, and the other important club leaders were imprisoned or driven into hiding. Caussidière was expelled from the Prefecture of Police; the scrupulous and humane Courtais removed from the command of the National Guard to make room for a more supple tool. Thus, the last outposts of the popular influence were gone, and their only leader left was Blanc, who, poor man, could not possibly have led an insurrection. Hence, when the real bitter struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat came in June, the latter fought without any outside aid, without a single recognised leader, without even a certain aim and policy.[2]

The leaders had been removed, but the real force of the proletariat remained. It was always possible that some leader might arise who would break the new-found dictatorship of the Assembly. The reactionaries could

[1] See the evidence at Barbès' trial at Bourges, March, 1849.

[2] It is true that the Luxembourg Commission remained in existence, but its vitality seems to have been seriously diminished by the resignation of Blanc on May 8. Moreover, on May 16 its papers were seized and its meeting-place occupied. The Committee, however, remained in existence.

not deliberate in safety until the Paris proletariat was finally crushed. Hence the manœuvres which led up to the massacres of June.

Before, however, we proceed further with the history of the Revolution, it is worth while summarising the important economic changes the advanced party had secured. First in importance comes the legalisation and growth of Trade Unions.[1] Most of these were new bodies, for although the ancient Freemason-like societies of "Mutualists," etc., made certain attempts, under the influence of Agricol Perdiguier, to control the movement, they were speedily felt to be inadequate to the task and resumed their previous slow decay. The workers also, through the Luxembourg, had secured a central organisation, a favourable organ of arbitration, and the fixing of a minimum wage in some industries and in very many a written agreement of some kind or other. All this was new, as was also the foundation of co-operative associations of producers, at first favoured by the State.

By decree of the Provisional Government the workers had secured—1, the limitation of the working day to ten hours in Paris, eleven in the Departments[2]; 2, the recognition of the Right to Work; 3, the abolition of sub-contracting (No. 81); 4, the recognition of the community's responsibility for industrial accidents (No. 75). The Tuileries was given as a hospital for that purpose, and M. Thomas, in charge of the National Workshops, instituted a careful and gratuitous medical service for his workers, which was extended also to the employee's wife and children.[3] When the workshops were dissolved later, the Constituent Assembly nevertheless caused the issue of a Circular (December 15, 1848), by which free treatment was provided for State employees. It quietly let die the proposals for protecting the ordinary worker; 5, authorised sweating and undercutting by work in convents, prisons and barracks was prohibited; 6, the *Conseils de Prudhommes*, bodies elected by the *patentés*—*i.e.*, members of corporations similar to our City Companies—were changed, on Flocon's advice, into bodies democratically elected by both employers and employed to serve as regular and recognised conciliation tribunals. The Assembly managed to make somewhat more cumbersome the method of election and to destroy Flocon's more far-reaching ideas,[4] but did nothing to injure the essentials.

The Constituent Assembly added or detracted very little from these very substantial gains, although it discussed many reforms which were far in advance of the conditions in England, for example. These discussions give a good idea of the atmosphere of the time and may be read in the reprint of the *Procès Verbaux de Comité de Travail de l'Assemblée*. But the Assembly did little, its members being for the most part doctrinaire Republicans who had not really formed any serious ideas of social reform.

The Legislative Assembly which succeeded it was reactionary in every sense. It passed only two economic measures of importance: one securing

[1] Friendly Societies were also legalised.
[2] The Assembly raised this to twelve all round.
[3] See Thomas: *Ateliers Nationaux*, p. 133.
[4] Flocon had intended the *prudhommes* to have power to fix an obligatory minimum wage and minimum price, and to become in all cases of dispute authorised "J.P.'s of Industry," as he called them.

the Sunday rest for State employees, the other—but this was carelessly enforced—limiting to ten hours the labour of children under 14 and forbidding night work. For the rest, in most cases, it either tacitly or explicitly ceased to enforce the reforms of the Provisional Government. Yet it would be a mistake to imagine that their effect was lost. It was rare that in any case the traces of them disappeared and even then the workers retained their memory. It is much easier to demand the revival of a reform once tried and successful, than to gain the acceptance of an abstract and untried programme. In this, as in other ways, the Second Republic has justly been compared[1] to the sower who casts seeds which seem to die only to appear in strong growth later.

[2]To gain a clear idea of the events following upon May 15, we must return to the days of February and consider the establishment of the famous "National Workshops." We have seen (No. 73) how on February 25 the Government was forced to promise work for all. At first an orator had given expression to the popular feeling in saying "The People puts three more months of poverty at the disposal of the Republic"; but starvation and a financial crisis hitherto unprecedented in Paris forced the workers to demand something more substantial than this: a huge deputation headed by a worker named Marche came to interview the Government. They almost forced their way in; and Blanc draws a striking picture of the dark-faced worker leaning upon his rifle and enforcing agreement. Lamartine, with his silver voice and well-rounded periods, attempted to argue. "Enough of your phrases!" said Marche, and the decree was signed. It remained to give effect to the decree. Marie, an anti-Socialist, was put in charge of the establishment of National Workshops (No. 78). Great, and largely successful, efforts have been made to fasten this insane experiment upon Louis Blanc and the Socialists, by saying that, although they had nothing to do with its management and protested against it time and again, they were "morally responsible." In the latest edition of Blanc's and Thomas's books (J. A. R. Marriott, Clarendon Press) we find this statement repeated. It is only necessary to take a glance at Blanc's proposal to refute this (No. 68). We must also remember that the Luxembourg Commission did produce a careful and elaborate document, which the Assembly treated with contempt. The character and history, therefore, of the National Workshops, are entirely to be ascribed to the bourgeois parties.

They were essentially a revival of the old Charity Workshops (*ateliers de charité*) and were so named by prominent officials—in particular, Ledru-Rollin. They were worked in the following manner. Any unemployed man was to go to his town hall, receive a ticket from the mayor, and go to search for work at any of the workshops open. He was paid 40 sous if he found work, 30 sous if there was none for him. M. Marie made not the least efforts to provide work, or even to arrange organisation. Workers were sent forth in

[1] Renard, *op. cit.*, p. 227.
[2] For all this section, see especially Emile Thomas's *Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux*.

gangs, with hardly any tools and no instructions. M. Thomas says of his local bureau: "From five o'clock in the morning the Rue de Bondy became occupied by a tumultuous crowd, and up till nightfall the bureau and town hall itself were the scene of a permanent riot." No possible use could be made of the workers, and it was a certain means of pauperising and demoralising the steadier portions of the Paris proletariat. Nevertheless, for the minute it kept alive the crowds of unemployed, it discredited the Socialists who had first spoken of the Right to Work, and, when establishments were closing down or discharging workers broadcast, it was, perhaps, not inconvenient for the Paris employer to see his most incompetent and useless workmen drawn away. Hence the bourgeoisie, for the minute, let the "Workshops" go on.

There is, however, a limit to the amount of State-paid riot and wanton waste which the French bourgeois will permit. The numbers of the workers grew as the work to be done decreased; M. Marie's deliberate incompetence grew intolerable. A typical bureaucrat, M. Emile Thomas, came to offer Marie a scheme for the regimentation of the workers, and, unlike most purveyors of set schemes, was, to his surprise, entrusted with its execution. (March 6).

There now began an immense experiment in State action of the kind which is generally associated in England with the name of the Fabian Society. Its direction was partly in the hands of M. Thomas, jealous for the success of his scheme, partly in the hands of the Government, determined to force the failure of any experiment acknowledging the hateful Right to Work.

The scheme of Emile Thomas is briefly outlined in Nos. 82 and 89. It should be added, however, that this skeleton gives no adequate idea of the size of the organisation or its complexity. Before their dissolution the Workshops contained over 100,000 men. Again, M. Thomas instituted a hierarchy of officials,[1] who practically eliminated the difficulties which an elective system would have placed in his way. He was able, moreover, to complete very large works of public utility and to open factories to supply the workers with tools, clothes, etc. In a very short while, his organisation was so efficient that he was able to promise the workers one day's work for each day's idleness.[2]

This promise was never fulfilled. The one thing which the Government would not do was to give him work for his workers. His incessant and urgent demands met with no response. In a very brief while he could say that his promise was a dead letter, the work done was completely useless and unproductive, and he was forced to use more than double the men necessary to complete it.

Nevertheless, the real object of the Government was achieved. Their

[1] Of course, of the proper reactionary shade. His right-hand man, Jaime, seems to have been a peculiarly dubious Republican. See the *Bulletin* of the Société d'Histoire de la Revolution de 1848, I, Parts 5 and 6, and Jaime's speech in Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

[2] As Mr. H. A. L. Fisher (*The Republican Tradition*, p. 186) is guilty of the assertion that the workers were "over-paid," it is worth while recalling that they were paid two francs a day if they worked, one franc if they did not. Hence, at the most they could earn nine francs a week; rarely could they even do that. Compare with these figures Thomas's eulogy of the doctors who worked for him *presque pour rien* —for a mere five francs a day.

aim was indubitably to create a large paid army, dependent upon the "moderate Republicans," which would destroy the influence of the Socialists; hence the military discipline, the "Service of Moral Instruction" directed by M. Chailly, etc. That this was so admits of no doubt. See particularly the conversation reported in No. 85.

And this fact was almost public. Lamartine, for example, says: "As they were directed and sustained by leaders who were in the confidence of the anti-Socialist portion of the Government, the workshops counterbalanced, until the coming of the National Assembly, the partisan workers of the Luxembourg. So far from being in the pay of Louis Blanc, they were the device of his adversaries." Thomas himself, before the Commission of Enquiry, says: "I always co-operated with the Mayor of Paris in fighting the influence of MM. Ledru-Rollin, Flocon and others; I was openly hostile to the Luxembourg, I openly fought the influence of M. Louis Blanc."[1]

If, however, we were to multiply proofs of the real nature of this astute attempt to divide the working-class, we should have to quote the whole of Thomas's book, in which every word is pregnant with hatred of the Luxembourg. Suffice it that his personal benevolence, his strong character and efficient organisation gave him a tremendous and almost tyrannical influence over his men's minds. For example, before the elections he made open and deliberate use of this Government machine to oppose Ledru-Rollin and Louis Blanc. There is little doubt that his efforts had a very great influence. Again, on May 15, when thousands of his workers had joined the demonstrators, he sent out emissaries to bring them away. They obediently left the procession at once.

If we hold in our minds these two points:—1, That the workshops were required to fail in their ostensible object; 2, that their real aim was to split the working-class for the benefit of the bourgeoisie, we shall be the less astonished at the behaviour of the Assembly.

After May 15 the Assembly—erroneously—held that the Socialists had been crushed. It proceeded to attempt to destroy a weapon for which it had no further use. On May 24, Thomas was presented, by his new chief, Trélat, with a document, which he was ordered to issue at once. This contained two important provisions: firstly, that all workers should be expelled from the workshops who either refused, though eligible, to enter the army, or refused any offer of employment from any outside employer; secondly, that brigades should at once be formed to be sent to the provinces (See No. 93). In horror, M. Thomas went at once to see M. Trélat and assured him that this order could only result in instant and serious trouble. M. Trélat appeared convinced, but two days later Thomas was kidnapped by orders of the Government and transported to Bordeaux. Trélat's agent, Lalanne, took his place.

Once in command of the workshops, Trélat perhaps realised that the dangers Thomas had prophesied were but too real. In any case, he held up

[1] Report of the Commission of Enquiry, I, 352. Thomas is also alleged to have been a Bonapartist agent, or, alternatively, to have dreamed of a dictatorship for himself. These charges, which seem to outstep the bounds of the probable, are in any case unproved; but there may well be some truth in the former. See Robert Pimienta: *Propagande Bonapartiste en* 1848, p. 28

the offensive regulations, and the workshops for the minute went on as before, except that Lalanne very quickly reduced Thomas's organisation to chaos, and his attitude to the workers drove them swiftly into opposition. Before long their interests were clear to them, and their delegates coalesced with the Luxembourg (No. 95). The forces of the proletariat were reunited.

But, however cautious M. Trélat might be, the final decision did not rest with him. The Assembly, convoked primarily to frame the constitution, had taken upon itself to govern the country. The financial crisis was abating in its violence, and it was fairly clear to the bourgeoisie that if only they had the natural and proper reserve of unemployed workers things might in time be re-established on a reasonable basis. Now, the workshops, which by now contained 115,000 men, while 50,000 more were seeking admission,[1] supported and fed the unemployed. They were a serious drain upon the finances of the country and, moreover, potentially a means of labour organisation. Hence, although by now perfectly aware of the danger, the Assembly was determined to have done with the workshops, and, led by the feline politician, de Falloux, persecuted the miserable Trélat until on June 21 the offensive edict was published, together with additional provisions of extraordinary stupidity and injustice (See No. 93). The bourgeoisie had declared war upon the proletariat. It was, moreover, to be a war of annihilation. Cavaignac, in spite of the protests of the Government, was withdrawing his troops from Paris in order to give the revolt time to grow strong enough to fight a pitched battle. Thus, not only would the French soldiery, and particularly their general, gain military glory, but an excuse would be provided for the extermination of the Socialist workers. It is probable that strong posts scattered about the city would have prevented the insurrection altogether; certainly the combat could not have been so bloody; but Cavaignac repulsed this suggestion with fury, saying that he was not there to defend their damned Parisian Guard and would blow his brains out rather than risk a single post of his soldiers. The Government realised that the soldier was their master and helplessly allowed him to continue withdrawing his troops from the disaffected regions, and eventually had to make way for him altogether during the revolt.

Even before the publication of Trélat's violent decree, the workers had held protest meetings between the Porte St. Denis and Porte St. Martin, and cheered sometimes for the Social Democratic Republic, sometimes for "'Poléon, 'Poléon."[2] But although the Royalists and Bonapartists made attempts to turn the movement to their advantage, the delegates kept their aim clearly before the workers' eyes (No. 95). It must, however, be admitted that this, the first conscious revolt of a Socialist proletariat, was singularly inarticulate. In Nos. 94 and 96, I have collected all the published documents which I can find to represent the insurgents' views. It will be seen that they attach themselves to the phrase "Social-Democratic Republic," by which

[1] Figures from Léon Faucher's speech in the Assembly on June 16.

[2] "Between these two cries there is not the abyss one might suppose. It is a phenomenon often repeated in the course of history: hoping nothing more from the bourgeoisie, the working-class turns to a man, a Saviour, a dictator. Dictatorship is the common fruit of social wars."—RENARD.

indubitably they meant the vague aspirations they connected with the name of Louis Blanc.[1]

On June 22, the workers were all collected at their usual pay-offices and sent a deputation to Marie, headed by Louis Pujol (No. 94), who appears in history for this fleeting moment, never to appear again. They were received with insults and menaces. They withdrew, convinced that war was inevitable. Next day, all the East End of Paris was covered with barricades. Arrayed against them the proletariat found the National Guard, the Garde Mobile—a terrible organisation, the "élite of the slums drilled for butchery," which excelled in brutality—the whole of the army, and the forces of the Government. Hopelessly outnumbered, they resisted the ever-growing forces of Cavaignac for three days. No such terrible orgy of blood had ever previously been seen in Paris. Betrayed again and again by their own chivalry, the workers were driven by their opponents from one barricade only to defend another. At one time, if properly led, they could have taken the Hôtel de Ville; but failing in this, they were overwhelmed by numbers.[2]

Even after all these years it is difficult to repress a movement of horror at the behaviour of Cavaignac and his underlings (Nos. 97-100). The loss on both sides in battle has been conjecturally estimated at 16,000.[3] But this makes no allowance for the shooting of unarmed men and the prisoners who surrendered under promise of amnesty. Rape and pillage may, it is true, have occurred, but for the most part the soldiers of the Republic had not time for these diversions, being occupied in shooting prisoners *en masse* without trial or even legitimate suspicion. By the side of Cavaignac, Carrier of Nantes is a gentle and pious man. The conduct of the victorious bourgeoisie would have disgraced a Tartar horde; for savages at least do not cover up their crimes with the names of justice and mercy.

After the unconditional surrender—Cavaignac would accept no other, and the Government had quietly abdicated its power into his hands on the 25th—of the Faubourg St. Antoine on June 26, the class war was, for the bourgeoisie, ended. The problem of unemployment had been solved by the

[1] Not even the names of their leaders are known. P. de la Gorce (I, 385), a hostile historian, says: "To whatever side we turn we find no general direction. The engineers of La Chapelle, who were hidden in the Clos St. Lazare, the brigadiers of the National Workshops, who could be seen behind the barricades of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine with their cards in their hats and their ribbon in their buttonhole, the old Montagnards [*Jacobins*], assembled in the Faubourg du Temple or the Faubourg Saint-Jacques, a few deluded old soldiers who loaded the weapons of the least-experienced insurgents and commanded the firing on the troops—these were the leaders of sedition, subordinate and unknown leaders, selected for the most part by chance—yet not therefore contemptible, since, unlike more famous demagogues, they had the merit of knowing how to die." "A worker named Jeanne" is vaguely referred to as "their commander-in-chief," but nothing is really known. G. Bouniols (*Histoire de la Révolution de* 1848, p. 238) quotes another workers' proclamation which I have not been able to trace: viz., "The National Workshops are an admirable and philanthropic institution which could have the best results beneath a wise and able administration. It is organisation which they have lacked." Another fragment, probably of the same placard, is given in L. Blanc (*Histoire de la Révolution de* 1848, ii, 135): "It is not our will that is insufficient for the work, but work suited to our professions is lacking for our labour. We earnestly demand it. You demand the instant suppression of 110,000 workers who derive each day from their modest pay the means of life for themselves and their families. Shall they be left to the evil counsels of hunger and the impulsion of despair?"

[2] The estimates of the numbers of the armed forces on the Government's side vary considerably. The regular troops, excluding the National Guard, the Garde Républicaine, and the Garde Mobile, numbered at the beginning 56,000 men. (V. Pierre, p. 376.) In any case, they were vastly superior to the insurgents, who cannot have numbered more than 50,000 at the most.

[3] The English Press gave 50,000 dead as the figures. The Prefecture of Police gave the obviously false figure of 1,460. Figures are, as a matter of fact, unobtainable. See G. Renard, in *Histoire Socialiste IX*, p. 82.

massacre of the unemployed. Indeed, they had been almost too thorough; a vexatious difficulty was experienced in procuring workers for a little while. The Assembly was able to resume its real work, the drafting of a constitution, amid the silence of the grave. Cavaignac, as head of the Executive, maintained martial law in Paris while it proceeded with its task. Business was recovering its normal tenour quickly; the workshops were closed and over 4,000 suspects had been deported, without trial or investigation, to die in the tropics. A proper atmosphere of peace had been created in which the Assembly could perform its task.

The document which it eventually issued, the Constitution of 1848, was in no sense an inspiring document. It proclaimed all the usual "liberties" in general terms, while reducing them to nothing by its detailed application. It placed, as Marx says, an all-powerful President, elected by popular suffrage, in opposition to an all-powerful Assembly. We need not concern ourselves further with it, since this is not a political history of France.[1] It was this point which gives the key to the later history of the Revolution. For when the Presidential elections were held in December the same ignorant peasant mass that had produced the National Assembly gave expression to another unexpected intention. Of the three possible candidates, Cavaignac, Lamartine and Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, one name alone conveyed any meaning to the peasant[2]. Therefore, Bonaparte received 5,400,000 votes, being four times the total of Cavaignac, and 300 times that of Lamartine[3]: and this insignificant mean-looking little man, of squalid reputation, was now opposed to the Assembly, with a mandate equal in weight to its own.

Meanwhile, under the leadership of Ledru-Rollin, the Radical Republicans, who represented the *petit bourgeois* and had assumed the name of the Mountain, found themselves relegated to the outcast position that the Socialists had occupied before June. We find, therefore, that they made a strong bid for the support of the remnants of the class-conscious proletariat. Ledru-Rollin's programme (No. 101) shows this clearly. It also does not need much perspicuity to perceive in his programme the mind of a small proprietor.

His followers were commonly called "démoc-socs" (democratic Socialists); he advocated the Social Republic as he understood it and secured the support of most of the old "Reds." Socialism having been extinguished in blood, the conscious portion of the proletariat naturally turned to support social reforms.

In this, the second period, which dates from the end of June, 1848, to June 13, 1849, the centre of interest is the foreign policy of Bonaparte. Previous to June, it will be remembered, Lamartine (No. 80) had offered

[1] See Renard (*op. cit.* p. 102 *et sqq.*) for an analysis of it. It, of course, rejected the "Right to Work." "This was the victory of civilisation over barbarism," exclaimed Quentin Bauchart.

[2] Many firmly believed that they were voting for the old Napoleon.—Renard, p. 126.

[3] The voting was:—

Louis Bonaparte	5,434,226
Cavaignac	1,448,107
Ledru-Rollin	379,119
Raspail	36,920
Lamartine	17,910
Changarnier	4,790
Spoiled votes	12,600

Lamartine, Cavaignac, Bonaparte, and possibly Ledru-Rollin, were thought to have a chance. Changarnier was a Royalist general, Raspail a revolutionary Socialist. The spoiled votes were nearly all for Bonaparte.

assistance to the revolutionary nations of Europe. This policy had been abandoned by Cavaignac in favour of complete non-intervention. Finally, Bonaparte was about to go to the other extreme and attack the revolutionary forces. On April 22, 1849, General Oudinot embarked for Civita Vecchia, ostensibly to defend the Roman Republic. Quickly the news came through that he had attacked it and met with defeat outside the walls of Rome. The Assembly was indignant, but was too deeply involved and unable to do more than pass a resolution of disapproval. Nevertheless, Bonaparte felt it prudent to amuse the Assembly by starting negotiations with Rome through de Lesseps, until the results of the elections for the new Assembly should be announced.

On May 29 these were known and de Lesseps at once recalled. The Party of Order had no longer any need to wear a mask.

Out of just over 700 members, the Party of Order, now composed entirely of reactionary Catholics, counted 450, all monarchists. The bourgeoisie had no further use for the "pure Republicans" of Cavaignac; they had done reaction's dirty work in June, and met with the appropriate reward. Between 50 and 75 alone were returned: Lamartine, Marie, Marrast, Garnier Pagès and Senard were all "out." On the other hand, the advanced Republicans had at last learnt their lesson and undertaken a patient campaign in the countryside and the army. Hence, Ledru-Rollin led nearly 200 "Montagnards" in the Assembly. His party had gained the majority of the soldiers' votes and predominated in Alsace, the centre and south-east of France. Both soldiers and peasants had polled heavily. The two strongest props of reaction had been shaken; and in the by-elections of 1850 Ledru-Rollin's party polled even better.

Although nothing came of it at the minute, this, the first penetration of the "Reds" to the countryside deserves explanation. The recovery of the towns had been helped by the influx of gold,[1] but also by the importation of foreign corn, which had hit the French peasant badly. Capital grew more difficult to get and the price of farms went down heavily. M. Renard (*op. cit.*, p. 321) gives a valuable table:—

Year	*Av. rent per hectare*	*Sale value*	*Rate of Interest*
1847	15.90	481	3.30
1848	15.70	451	3.48
1849	15.56	443	3.51
1850	14.96	422	3.56

In addition, one-half of the small proprietors (three millions) were exempt from taxation as "indigent"; that is to say, the tiny plot of ground which the French call "a pocket handkerchief" had become no longer remunerative. These facts were, no doubt, largely responsible for the comparative success of the "Red" campaign in the country.

Since the Party of Order had expelled successively the Radical Republicans and the Moderates, it had left in it no further democratic elements to reject. Other clefts, therefore, began to show themselves. There began to appear in it the division between Legitimist and Orleanist which is

[1] Twenty-one millions in 1847; 42 millions in 1848.

so curious and apparently unreasonable a quarrel in French politics. It is very difficult to believe that French business men were really deeply moved by the wrongs of Henri V, or felt strongly that he had an inalienable right to the throne of France which it was their moral duty to support. The position is far simpler to understand when we remember that while under the Legitimist Charles X, the large landowning interests had controlled the Government, under Louis Philippe of Orleans the big business interests had come into power. This distinction, which is, of course, only roughly true, explains why there was a division which could not be bridged by Henry V declaring the Orleanist Count of Paris his heir.

For the minute, however, these differences were in abeyance. They were of minor significance in face of the two other problems presented to the Party of Order—the suppression of Radical Republicanism and the task of keeping the scamp Prince-President in his place. For as yet no one would take his Napoleonic attitudes seriously.

It was the first task which was the most serious. And if we are astonished at the ease with which it was accomplished, we must remember that the commercial crisis was over and France entering upon a phase of extreme prosperity. Very few of the workers, none of the bourgeoisie, had any immediate material gain to expect from the reassertion of revolutionary principles.

In any case, the fall of the Mountain was pitiable. In the first days of June came through the news of the siege of Rome, a flagrant violation of Article V of the Constitution. The infuriated democrats committed the folly of turning from the Assembly, where they were strong, to the streets, where they were weak. On June 13, Ledru-Rollin led an *émeute* in the streets of Paris. Unarmed and unorganised, the rioters were at once suppressed; indeed, the revolt was hardly a serious affair at all. Ledru-Rollin fled.

The consequences of this miserable scuffle were serious. The Party of Order had, by one stroke, secured the supremacy of the upper classes and the Catholic party. It proceeded immediately to enact a series of repressive laws, which made any serious Republican propaganda practically a penal offence; destroyed any remnants of liberty that were left; persecuted soldiers and others who had voted badly; and did everything to make impossible a recovery on the part of the decapitated and discredited Mountain.

The third period of the Revolution, which commences here, is of little interest to us. The upper bourgeoisie, Catholicism and reaction were firmly seated in the saddle, and the history of the next two years is merely the history of a sordid scramble for the emoluments of power between parties whose real differences were negligible. Did a danger arise, as in the by-elections of March, 1850, of a revival of the Mountain, the parties reunited at once.

The astute policy of Bonaparte, which we need not study in detail, enabled him to gain the credit for strong government—since his Ministers rapidly became independent of the Assembly—and to throw on to the Assembly the unpopularity excited by its reactionary measures, which culminated in the withdrawal of universal suffrage in May, 1850. Bonaparte was able to

flatter the workers with his protests against the behaviour of the Assembly, to reassure the big financiers by his connections with the Bourse and the character of his Ministers, and to retain his popularity with the peasants. Meanwhile, business was brisk and 1850 was a year of unexampled prosperity.

The game which the Assembly was playing—intrigues of Orleanist against Legitimist, and of both against Bonaparte—might have gone on for a long time, since Bonaparte benefited by the continual recruits, who saw the impossibility of a settlement being reached between the two Royalist parties. But his tenure of power would come finally to an end in December, and he had to take some action.[1]

Fortunately for him, the Party of Order in the Assembly had discredited itself with its supporters. Its Catholicism had run to extremes undesired by the bourgeoisie.[2] Its crude reactionary tendencies were felt to be dangerous. It was too obviously showing up the Republic as naked class-rule. Moreover, during the whole year of 1851, France suffered again from a serious commercial crisis, which led to the usual demand for "strong government." Instead of this, the dissolving Party of Order was merely occupied in heckling and hindering the President, and found at the end of 1851 that it had no supporters.

The Assembly having refused to vote the revision of the constitution by the requisite majority, Louis Bonaparte proceeded to bring to Paris the instruments of his *coup d'état:* Generals Magnan and Leroy Saint Arnaud, and Police Inspector Maupas. Little excitement occurred when on December 2, 1851, he dissolved by force the Assembly and arrested a large proportion of its members. For a minute, trouble was feared: barricades were built and there was some firing; moreover, part of the "gilded youth" of Montmartre began to co-operate with the workers. But ever since June, 1848, the workers had been disarmed, and Louis Bonaparte had the army perfectly at his disposal. As for the recalcitrant bourgeoisie, they were disposed of by the means they had themselves initiated: a fusillade in the Boulevard Montmartre on December 3 upon an unarmed crowd of fashionable men and women.[3] In any case, what enthusiasm could be raised to defend this Assembly, when its members tumbled over each other in their haste to be arrested? Moreover, had not Bonaparte announced the restoration of universal suffrage?[4]

There was more trouble in the Provinces, but, once established, Bonaparte quickly suppressed that. An immense system of police spying was utilised, with the result of 15,000 deportations—this is the official figure, certainly 100,000 (Lanjuinais) is, if anything, too small—of uncondemned men, for the most part sent to a certain slow death in the tropics at Lambessa or Cayenne. All over France was organised a reign of terror to make certain of the success of Bonaparte's pretensions. It was efficient enough to secure 7,439,216 votes in the plebiscite for the new regime, as against 640,737; but these figures, in view of the internal state of France, have little meaning.

Nevertheless, "la Bourse montait": the Parisian financier at least was

[1] He could not be re-elected for four years.
[2] Even in 1849 the "loi Falloux" had subordinated education to the clergy in an amazing manner.
[3] 1,200 casualties (*Times*) But they had themselves to thank for it. They had set the example in June.
[4] Girardin proposed to call a general strike. But the deputies considered it impracticable

pleased. But he was Bonaparte's only supporter outside the army; for the rest, the new Government remained in a perilous equilibrium between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, finding certain support in neither. On November 20 next year, Bonaparte became officially Emperor, having military and financial support alone certain, and a declining prestige in the rural districts. France was fated to be the first to see the commonest phenomenon of to-day; a militarist Imperialism tinged with ugly financial interests and supported at home by repression of opinion and demagogic spasmodic cajolery of the people.

Bibliography

The student of the French Revolution of 1848 must go to French works. In English there are only two books of any value, Lord Normanby's *A Year of Revolution*, which is the diary of himself when British Ambassador in Paris, and Louis Blanc's 1848: *Historical Revelations*. Both of these are partisan, especially the former, which is deeply tinged with oligarchic prejudice.

In French, the essential work is Vol. IX of the *Histoire Socialiste*, M. Georges Renard's *La République de* 1848, which should be read with the *Références*, published separately. The clerical and reactionary point of view is stated at great length in P. de la Gorce: *Histoire de la 2nde République Française* (2 vols.). Details omitted by the others may be sometimes gathered from an older (anti-Socialist) work, V. Pierre's *Histoire de la République de* 1848. A convenient short history is G. Bouniols' work of the same title. Marx's *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* is a very brilliant analysis, but only incidentally gives the history. It is, in any case, devoted mainly to the years 1849-1851. The economic background should be studied in J. A. Blanqui's *Des Classes ouvrières en* 1848, and Louis Blanc's *Organisation du Travail* (Clarendon Press ed., by J. A. R. Marriott, 5s.).

The writings of the revolutionaries of the period should be studied also; apart from the better-known works of Proudhon, Marx, Considérant, etc., L. A. Blanqui's *Critique Sociale*, Louis Blanc (*op. cit.*), F. Vidal, *Vivre en Travaillant*, and Ledru-Rollin, *Écrits Divers*, may be mentioned.

If it is desired to study further, the following works are valuable:—

A. Contemporary Histories: *Histoires de la Révolution de* 1848, by Louis Blanc (incorporating the "Historical Revelations"), Garnier Pagès, Lamartine, and Daniel Stern. The first two are the most important.

B. Other Authorities: It will have been observed that *placards* were the predominating type of revolutionary propaganda in 1848; hence, *Les Murailles Révolutionnaires* (A. Delvau), though badly indexed and incomplete, is very valuable.

The Journals are of minor importance, although the files of the following are worth consulting:—

Le National (Parliamentary Opposition under Louis Philippe).
La Réforme (Extreme Left under Louis Philippe).

L'Organisation du Travail (revolutionary, but, in fact, financed by Bonapartists).
Le Représentant du Peuple (Proudhon).
La Democratie Pacifique (Fourierist).
La Presse (Emile de Girardin).

C. Special Studies: The days of February have been subjected to an exhaustive study by A. Crémieux: *La Révolution de Février.* The defence of the Provisional Government may be read in Lamartine's *Trois Mois au pouvoir.* But two works of P. Quentin Bauchart upon this period should be consulted: *Lamartine et la Politique Étrangère de la Révolution de Février* and *Lamartine: La Politique Intérieure.* There is a *Vie de A. T. Marie* by Chérest.

For the actions, characters, etc., of the Socialists and Red Republicans see the following:—

H. Bourgin: *Victor Considérant.*
Louis Blanc: *La Révolution au Luxembourg* (for the Luxembourg Commission).
J. F. Jeanjean: *Armand Barbès* (one volume only issued up to date).
G. Geffroy: *L'Enfermé* (life of Blanqui).
S. Wassermann: *Les Clubs de Barbès et de Blanqui* (this has an excellent bibliography).
I. Tchernoff: *Louis Blanc: Associations et Sociétés Secretes sous la 2me République.*

E. Picattier has written a study of the workshops (*Les Ateliers Nationaux en* 1848), which is little more than a *rechauffée* of a more important work, Emile Thomas' *Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux* (Clarendon Press, 5s.), which is the only authority on the workshops and full of very valuable information. The propaganda of the Bonapartists in the early days is investigated in Robert-Pimienta's *La Propagande Bonapartiste en* 1848.

For the June days one should read Louis Menard's *Prologue d'une Révolution* (reprinted in *Cahiers de la Quinzaine, V,* 18), and the official *Rapport de la Commission d'Enquête,* which, however, should be used circumspectly, as it is very biased.

If anybody desires to pursue his studies later he may read the *Mémoires* of de Falloux and any of the lives of Thiers and Napoleon III, also Odilon Barrot's *Mémoires.*

The *Bulletin* of the *Société d'Histoire de la Révolution de* 1848 contains much valuable matter: also two other publications of the same society, viz.:—

Procès Verbaux du Comité de travail de l'Assemblée[1]
Dutacq: *La Révolution à Lyon.*

Note also:—Ferdinand Dreyfus: *L'Assistance sous la Deuxieme République.*
O. Festy: *Associations ouvrières sous la 2me République.*

And, as always, the following works are very valuable:—

G. Weill: *Histoire du Parti Républicain.*
E. Levasseur: *Histoire des classes ouvrières,* 1789-1870.

[1] This gives an insight into the attitude of the Constituent Assembly towards the workers. Three millions francs had been promised "for the workers" during the June insurrection: these were eventually went largely to promote profit-sharing associations.

Documents

68 CONCLUSION OF LOUIS BLANC'S "THE ORGANISATION OF LABOUR," FIRST PUBLISHED IN BOOK FORM IN 1839.

THE Government should be regarded as the supreme director of production, and invested with great strength to accomplish its task.

This task would consist in availing itself of competition itself, to destroy competition.

The Government should raise a loan which would be applied to the foundation of *social factories* in the most important branches of the national industry.

This foundation, requiring the investment of considerable funds, the number of original factories would be rigorously limited; but by virtue of their very organisation, as will be seen in the sequel, they would be gifted with an immense power of expansion.

The government, being considered as the only founder of the *social factories*, must also provide them with Statutes. These, having been discussed and voted by the representatives of the nation, would have the force and form of laws.

All workmen giving guarantees of good conduct to be admitted to work in the social factories, as far as the original capital would provide instruments of labour.

Although the false and anti-social education given to the present generation renders it difficult to find elsewhere than in an increase of remuneration a motive of emulation and encouragement, the wages would be equal—and an entirely new education should change old ideas and customs.

For the first year, following the establishment of social factories, the government would regulate the hierarchy of workers. After the first year it would be different. The workmen having had time to appreciate one another, and all being equally interested, as will be seen, in the success of the association, the hierarchy would be appointed on the elective principle.

Every year an account of the net profits would be made out and divided into three portions: One to be equally divided among members of the association. The second—1, for the support of the old, the sick and the infirm; 2, for the alleviation of the crises weighing upon other branches of industry—all labour owing mutual support to its fellows. The third, lastly, to be devoted to the furnishing of instruments of labour to those desirous of joining the association, so that it might extend itself indefinitely.

Into each of these associations, formed for trades which can be exercised

on a large scale, could be admitted those belonging to professions whose very nature compels those pursuing them to be scattered and localised. Thus each social factory might be composed of various trades grouped about one great centre, separate parts of the same whole, obeying the same laws and sharing in the same advantages.

Each member of the social factory should be at liberty to dispose of his wages to his own convenience; though the evident economy and incontestable excellence of living in community could not fail to bring from the association for labour the voluntary association of wants and pleasures.

Capitalists should be admitted into the association, and receive interest for their capital, to be guaranteed by the budget; but not participate in the profits unless in the capacity of workmen.

69 A. A. LEDRU-ROLLIN: ELECTION ADDRESS.

POLITICAL PRINCIPLES STATED TO THE ELECTORS[1] OF SARTHE IN JULY, 1841.

* * * Sovereignty of the people—that is the great principle which our fathers proclaimed nearly fifty years ago. Yet what has happened to it? Relegated to the phrases of a constitution, this sovereignty has disappeared in the domain of reality. For our fathers, the people meant the whole nation, in which each man had an equal share in political rights, just as God has given him an equal share in the air and sunlight. To-day, the people means a herd led by a few privileged persons like you and me, gentlemen, who are called Electors, and then by some even more privileged persons who are dignified with the title of Deputies.

And if this unrepresented people rises to recover its rights, it is thrown in prison. If it groups itself into associations to save itself from a death of starvation and to protect its insufficient wage, it is thrown in prison. If, as in the terrible, unforgettable days at Lyons,[2] it writes on its standard "Bread or Death," the machine-guns are turned upon it and the mutilated corpses slandered after their death.

In answer to its despairing cries, voices from the Chamber can be heard, saying: "People, what is your will? What do you demand? Are you not sovereign, people, are you not king?" Insolent derision! Contemptible irony! The Pharisees of another day called King Him who came to reveal a new religion, to preach to men equality and fraternity. They called Him King, but they flogged Him, they crowned Him with thorns, they blasphemed and insulted Him to His face. The people, gentlemen, is the *Ecce Homo* of modern times; but, believe me, the resurrection is at hand; it too

[1] The "electors" were, of course, drawn from the upper classes only.
[2] 1831. See p. 76.

shall descend from the cross to require account for their deeds from those who have so long abused it. (*Prolonged cheers.*)

Such, gentlemen, is the people under a representative government.

* * * * * * * * *

But for us, gentlemen, the People is everything. Our aim is to relieve its poverty and sorrows. What distinguishes the democratic party from all others, I repeat, is that it will always turn from political questions to social advancement. (*Hear, hear.*) And the first, the most capital reform, gentlemen, is the revision of taxation. The revolution of '89 in this too proclaimed equality, but practice here gives the lie to theory most cruelly. Taxation, direct or indirect, always weighs heaviest on the poor classes: their assessment and the proportion they bear must be changed * * *

There is another question, gentlemen, which is even more serious, and on which depends the future of modern society. It is the question of wages.

Is there a single one of us who, when he goes about our manufacturing cities, our great centres of population, does not feel moved—moved even to tears at the sight of men whose lives know no happiness, who can hardly gain by unremitting toil enough to satisfy their most urgent needs? At the sight of young girls earning six *sous* a day and forced to turn to cold-blooded and systematic prostitution for the food they cannot earn? (*Very true.*) At the sight of feeble and emaciated children, doomed to gain, at far too early an age, in work above their strength, the bread their father cannot earn? At the sight of old men, betrayed by advancing age, who can find no place of rest except under the stigma of prison?

Well, gentlemen, in face of these shameful sores of our society, in face of these most legitimate and sacred interests, what has Representative Government done?

In the Chamber, to speak only of the last session, the first business is the Address. Each year, at this point seems to appear a glimmer of hope; but it is nothing but emptiness and lies, the movement and conflict of private ambitions. The menacing prospect always ends in more and more servile adulation of the ruling power.

Then comes the question of the East. At the thought of the Pyramids, that short and glorious epic,[1] France feels her youth return. The army is full of determination; a tried sailor demands a word, but one word, to go and fire the English fleet. They discuss, negotiate, temporise; and meanwhile the English bombard Beyrouth and seize Acre. The tricolour is insulted; France, cringing before the foreigner and ejected from the council of kings, sees her glory dulled and her influence fallen! (*Sensation.*)

[1] Napoleon's campaign in Egypt, 1798.

Shall I speak of that burning question, the fortifications? Some, among whom am I, judged them at once from the hand that offered them; others appreciated this treacherous suggestion by the standards of their own honesty and loyalty. To-day, when the erection has begun, no doubts can remain at the sight of their partial and cunning execution. These fortifications, obtained on the pretext of defence against the foreigner are only used to suppress the liberties of France. (*Hear, hear.*)

And that is all the session! Through all these tedious days what has been done for the people, for that part of the people which has nothing to call its own, and throngs in rags about the threshold, knocks upon the door? Lictors! make way for its masters. Is not the budget voted? Has not each of these senators taken his part in it? Extorted enough to satisfy him and his? Lictors, force them to give way, that the Masters of the World may go to the country to rest from the work that they have not done. (*Loud cheers.*)[1]

1848 February 22: Opposition Banquet forbidden.

1848 February 22-24: Revolt of Paris. Abdication of the King.

70-72 PROCLAMATIONS OF PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENTS, FEBRUARY 24

(70)

IN THE NAME OF THE SOVEREIGN PEOPLE.

CITIZENS,

A Provisional Government has been installed. By the will of the people it is composed of citizens: Mr. ARAGO, LOUIS BLANC, MARIE, LAMARTINE, FLOCON,* LEDRU-ROLLIN,* RECURT,* MARRAST, ALBERT,[2] engineering worker. To carry out the measures to be taken by this government, the people's will has also chosen as delegates to the department of Police Citizens CAUSSIDIÈRE* and SOBRIER.* The same sovereign will of the people has appointed Citizen ETIENNE ARAGO* to the general Directorship of the Post Office.

In execution of the orders of the Provisional Government, bakers and victuallers are ordered to keep their shops open.

The people is expressly recommended not to abandon its arms,

[1] Ledru-Rollin was prosecuted by the Government of Louis Philippe for delivering this address. He was, however, acquitted. He secured his election for Sarthe, with only three dissentient voices.

[2] *Sic*, error for *Albert*. Albert was the only working-class member of this Government, and was added by an afterthought. Until the Constitution of the Luxembourg Commission most of the leaders of the working class were middle class in origin.

* Radical and Socialist members. Marrast was connected with the *National*, a paper which had, in spite of its bourgeois views, co-operated for a certain time with the *Réforme*. He afterwards became a follower of Cavaignac. Lamartine was the great poet-orator of the upper class Republicans: his reputation even now has not disappeared entirely. Marie was an anti-Socialist and Republican who believed that the "times were unripe: I love the Republic too much to see her come too soon."

positions or revolutionary attitude. It has too often been deceived by treason * * *

Paris, Prefecture of Police,
Feb. 24th, 1848.

CAUSSIDIÈRE and SOBRIER

(71)

LIST of the members of the Provisional Government as chosen in the Chamber.[1]

DUPONT (de l'Eure)
ARAGO (of the Institute)[2]
LAMARTINE
LEDRU-ROLLIN
[LOUIS BLANC][3]
GARNIER PAGÈS[4]
MARIE[4]
CRÉMIEUX

(72) IN THE NAME OF THE FRENCH PEOPLE

* * * A provisional Government, arising from the acclamation and demand of the people and the deputies of the departments during the session of February 24th, is for the minute entrusted with the work of assuring and organising the national victory. It is composed of:—

MM.[5] Dupont (de l'Eure)
Lamartine,
Crémieux,
Arago (of the Institute)
Ledru-Rollin,
Garnier-Pagès,
Marie.

The Government has for secretaries:
MM. Armand Marrast,
Louis Blanc,
Ferdinand Flocon,
Aubert.

* * * The Provisional Government wishes a REPUBLIC, given the ratification of the people, who will be immediately consulted.

DUPONT (de l'Eure)
etc.

1848 February 25 Government refuses to fly the Red Flag.

[1] This Government issued no proclamation.
[2] Arago the astronomer, a Parliamentary Liberal.
[3] Approved, but struck out by Lamartine.
[4] In spite of shouts of "No! No!"
[5] Not "Citizens."

73-76 DECREES OF FEBRUARY 25

73 FRENCH REPUBLIC.[1]

Paris, February 25, 1848.

The Government of the French Republic pledges itself to guarantee the livelihood of the worker by labour;

It pledges itself to guarantee work for all citizens;

It recognises that the workers should form associations among themselves to enjoy the legitimate profit of their labour;

The Provisional Government returns to the workers, to whom it belongs, the Million [*francs*] which falls into its hands from the Civil List.

LOUIS BLANC, A Secretary of the Provisional Government.

GARNIER PAGÈS, Mayor of Paris.

74 FRENCH REPUBLIC.

The Provisional Government of the French Republic decrees:—

The objects in pawn at the *Mont de Piété*[2] since February 1st, consisting of linen, garments, clothes, etc., in value less than ten francs, shall be returned to the depositors. The Minister of Finance is instructed to provide for the expense thus incurred.

---

75 The Provisional Government of the French Republic decrees:—

Henceforward the Tuileries will serve as a hospital for workers injured in industry.

---

76 FRENCH REPUBLIC.

Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.

The Provisional Government decrees the immediate establishment of national workshops.

The Minister of Public Works is entrusted with the execution of this decree.

The Members of the Provisional Government of the Republic.

77 SPEECH OF L. A. BLANQUI TO THE CENTRAL REPUBLICAN SOCIETY ON FEBRUARY 26[3]

FRANCE is not Republican. The Revolution which has just been completed is only a happy surprise, nothing more. If to-day we try to bring to power men whose names are compromised in bourgeois eyes by political condemnations, the provinces will be alarmed, will remember the

[1] Written by Louis Blanc in the presence of, and in reply to, a deputation of workers. The last sentence s Ledru-Rollin's. The whole of the Government, some no doubt reluctantly, signed the proclamation, ut the published placards read as above.

[2] State Pawnshops. Louis Philippe's Government had extorted an interest of 9½%.

[3] Blanqui had been excluded from the Government, which had also refused to adopt the red flag and vas of a largely bourgeois complexion. Hence the acting President of the Society, Crousse, had demanded *coup de main*, when Blanqui returned from interviewing the Government, and spoke as above.

Terror and the Convention, and, perhaps, recall the fugitive king. Even the National Guard was involuntarily our accomplice; it is composed of timid shopkeepers who to-morrow may well depose those whom yesterday they supported, with cries of *Vive la République*.

* * * Leave the men in the Hôtel de Ville to their impotence. Their feebleness is the certain presage of their fall. In their hands they have an ephemeral power; we—behind us we have the people and the clubs in which we shall organise ourselves for revolution as once the Jacobins did. Be content to wait a few days more and the Revolution will be ours. Suppose we seized power by an audacious stroke, like robbers under the darkness of night, who would answer for the duration of our power? Should we not find beneath us energetic and ambitious men burning to oust us by similar means?

What we need for our support is the mass of the people, the *faubourgs* in insurrection, a new August 10th.[1] Then we should at least have the prestige of a revolutionary force.

1848 February 28: Convocation of the Luxembourg Commission.

78 DECREE INSTITUTING NATIONAL WORKSHOPS, FEBRUARY 28

FRENCH REPUBLIC.

Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.

WORKERS:

BY a decision of this date, February 28th, 1848, the Minister of Public Works has ordered that the public works which have already been begun, should be resumed at once.

From Wednesday, March 1st, works of great importance will be organised in various places.

All workers who desire to take part in them should approach one of the mayors of Paris, who will receive their application and direct them without delay to the workshops.

Workers of Paris!

You desire to gain an honourable livelihood by labour. Be assured that all the efforts of the Provisional Government will aid you in this attempt.

The Republic expects, and justly expects, that the patriotism of all citizens will make them follow its example. In this way the amount of work available will be increased.

Then let labour everywhere be resumed. Workers! after victory, labour; that is yet another fine example you can give to the world. And you will give it.

The Minister of Public Works.

MARIE.

[1] See p. 18.

79 GLOVE WORKERS' ELECTION PLACARD OF ABOUT MARCH 1. (FOR THE LUXEMBOURG COMMISSION)[1]

NOTICE
to the
GLOVE WORKERS OF PARIS.

YOU are invited to present yourselves on Thursday the 9th of March, at 1 o'clock exactly, at the residence of Citizen DELIGNY, no. 13, Chaussée de Menilmontant, at the BOULE ROUGE,[2] to approve there of the nomination of the delegate charged to represent the trade on the central Committee sitting at the Luxembourg, and to give your assent to the reforms you have been demanding for so long.

In the name of the Representatives of several workshops,

CHEVREMONT, Provisional delegate.

80 A. DE LAMARTINE: "MANIFESTO TO EUROPE" (OF MARCH 2)

CIRCULAR
of the Minister of Foreign Affairs
to the diplomatic Agents of the French Republic.

SIR,—

YOU are aware of the events in Paris, of the victory of the people, of its heroism, its moderation, its pacification, and of order re-established by the aid of all citizens, as if in this interregnum of visible power, reason alone was the governor of France.

Thus has the French Revolution entered into its definitive period. France is a Republic; and the French Republic does not need to be recognised to exist. It lives by natural right and by national right. It is the will of a great people whose credentials can only be demanded by itself. Nevertheless, since the French Republic desires to enter into the family of established governments as a regular power and not as a disturbing element in European order, it is desirable that you should promptly make known to the government to which you are accredited the principles and tendencies which henceforward will guide the foreign policy of the French Government.

The proclamation of the French Republic is not an act of aggression against any form of government in the world. Forms of governments are legitimately as diverse as the characters, geographical situation, and mental, moral and material developments of the peoples. Nations, like individuals, vary in age, and the principles which guide them follow in successive phases. Monarchic, aristocratic, constitutional and Republican Governments are the expressions of the different degrees of maturity in the popular mind.

[1] This is the only indication I can find of the method of electing delegates to the Luxembourg Commission.

[2] "Red Ball," I presume a public-house.

Peoples demand more freedom as they feel themselves capable of supporting more: they demand more equality and democracy as they are the more inspired by justice and love for the people. A question of time. A people is as much lost by anticipating the hour of maturity as it is dishonoured by letting it pass uncaught. In the eyes of true statesmen, Monarchy and Republicanism are not two absolute principles which must fight to the death; but contrasting facts which may exist side by side, respecting and understanding each other.

Hence war is not a principle of the French Republic, as, in 1792, it was its mortal and glorious necessity. Between 1792 and 1848 lies half a century. To return, after half a century, to the principle of 1792, the principle of the conquest of an empire, would be retrograde and not progressive: and yesterday's revolution is a step forward, not a step back. We and the world both desire to advance towards fraternity and peace.

If the position of the French Republic in 1792 explains its warlike character, the difference between that epoch of our history and the present epoch explains its pacific character now. Let it be your endeavour to understand this difference and make it clear to those around you.

In 1792 the nation was not one. There were two peoples on the one soil. A terrible struggle was carried on between the classes that had lost their privileges and those that had but recently gained liberty and equality. The dispossessed classes joined with captive royalty and jealous foreigner to deprive France of the Revolution and to re-impose on her by invasion monarchy, aristocracy and theocracy. To-day there are no more distinct and unequal classes: liberty has freed all, equality before the law has levelled all: fraternity, which we proclaim and whose benefits the Assembly will organise, will unite all. No citizen of France, whatever his opinions, fails to rally to the principle of "Our country before all," nor, by this very unity, to make her free from anxiety or attempt at invasion.

In 1792 it was not the whole people that possessed itself of the Government, but the middle class alone which desired to exercise and enjoy liberty. The triumph of the middle class, as of any oligarchy, was selfish: it wished to keep to itself the rights conquered for all. To do this, it had to make a serious diversion in the people's advance, to hurry it to the battlefield to prevent it seizing its own government. This diversion was war. War was the desire of the *Monarchists* and the *Girondins*, not of the more advanced Democrats, who, like us, desired the true, complete and orderly reign of the people, understanding by that word all the classes without exception which make up the Nation.

In 1792 the people was the instrument and not the object of the Revolution. To-day the Revolution is made by it and for it. In itself it is the Revolution, and entering into it it brings with it its new needs of labour, industry, education, agriculture, commerce, morality, prosperity, property, livelihood, navigation—in fine of civilisation. And all these are the needs of peace. The people and peace are the same words.

In 1792, the ideas of France and Europe were not prepared to understand

and accept the mutual harmony of nations, to the general good. The thought of the dying century was hidden in the heads of a few philosophers. To-day philosophy is popular. Fifty years of freedom of thought, of speech and of writing have produced their effect. Books, newspapers and speeches have been the apostles of European enlightenment. Reason shining around and across the frontiers of peoples has created that great intellectual nation which will give the final achievement of the French Revolution and the institution of international fraternity to all the world.

Finally, in 1792, liberty was a novelty, equality a scandal and the Republic a problem. The right of the people, scarcely unveiled by Fénélon, Montesquieu and Rousseau, was so forgotten, buried and profaned by the old traditions of feudalism, monarchy and priesthood, that the most legitimate intervention of the people in its own affairs seemed a monstrosity to the Statesman of the old school. Democracy shook at once the thrones and the foundations of society. To-day thrones and peoples are used to the word, to the forms and orderly operations of liberty exercised in various proportions in nearly all States, even those monarchic in form. They will grow used to the Republic, its most complete form in the ripest nations. They will realise that there is such a thing as conservative liberty: that in a Republic may exist not merely better order, but that better order must exist in a government by all for all than in a government by a few for a few.

However apart from all these disinterested motives, the mere need of the consolidation and permanency of the Republic will inspire French statesmen with thoughts of peace. In war it is not our country that runs the worst risks. It is liberty. War is almost always a dictator. Soldiers forget institutions and remember persons. Thrones excite ambitious men. Glory dazzles the eyes of patriotism. The prestige of a victorious name covers an attack upon the national sovereignty. The Republic, indeed, desires glory, but for herself, not for a Cæsar or a Napoleon.

Yet make no mistake. These ideas, which the Provisional Government instructs you to present to the Powers as guarantees of European safety, are no requests to pardon the Republic for her audacity in coming to birth: still less humble prayers for the place of a great and legal European state. Their aim is nobler: to provoke sovereigns and peoples to thought and prevent involuntary mistakes concerning the character of our Revolution: to give light and its true character to this event: finally, to give pledges to humanity before giving them to our rights and honour if ever these are threatened.

The French Republic, then, will attack no one. Needless to say, war will be accepted, if conditions of war are forced upon the French people. The thought of the present rulers of France is of the happiness of France, if war is declared on her, and she is forced to grow in strength and glory despite her moderation: of her terrible responsibility if the Republic declares war without provocation. In the first case her martial genius, her impatient spirit, the strength she has accumulated during so many years of peace, would make her invincible at home and perhaps dangerous beyond her frontiers. In the

second case, she would rouse against her the memories of the conquests which turned the nations against her, and compromise her first, her widest alliance: the soul of the peoples and the spirit of civilisation.

In accordance with these principles, Sir, the considered principles of France, principles presented without fear and without defiance to friends and enemies alike, you will be good enough to take note of the following declarations.

In the eyes of the French Republic the treaties of 1815 exist no longer in law: nevertheless the territorial limits of these treaties are facts which it acknowledges as a basis in its relations with other nations.

But although the treaties of 1815 exist now only as facts to be modified by common consent, and although the Republic openly declares that its right and mission is to obtain these modifications pacifically and in a regular manner, the Republic's good sense, moderation, conscience and wisdom remain and are for Europe a better and more honourable guarantee than the letter of these treaties which it has so often broken or altered.

Exert yourself, Sir, to make this liberation of the Republic from the treaties of 1815 understood and genuinely admitted and to show that this frankness need in no way disturb the peace of Europe.

Thus we openly say that if we think that the decree of Providence has sounded the hour for the reconstruction of certain oppressed nationalities in Europe or elsewhere; if Switzerland, our faithful ally since Francis I, be repressed or threatened in her growing movement at home to add fresh force to the *fasces* of democratic governments; if the independent states of Italy be invaded; if limits or obstacles be placed to their internal changes; if armed force be used to prevent their joining in alliance to form an Italian motherland; then the French Republic would consider it its right to take up arms to protect these legitimate movements of growth and nationality.

You observe that the Republic has passed in one step the age of proscription and dictatorship. Decided never to veil liberty at home, equally decided never to veil her democratic principles abroad, it will not permit anyone to place his hand between its peaceful radiance of freedom and the eyes of the peoples of the world. It proclaims itself the enlightened and cordial ally of all rights, progress and legitimate development of all nations who wish to live by the same principles as its own. It will not undertake dark and incendiary propaganda among its neighbours. It knows that durable liberties can grow only from the native soil; but by the light of its ideals, by the example of order and peace that it hopes to give to the world, it will start the only true proselytising, that of admiration and sympathy. That is not war, but nature; not the disturbance of Europe, but life: it is not to set fire to the world, but to shine on the people's horizon to precede and guide them at once.

For humanity we desire, we even hope, that peace may remain. A year ago a question of war arose between France and England. Not the Republic caused it to arise, but the dynasty. The dynasty carries away with it the danger of a European war which it had caused by the purely personal ambition

of its family alliances in Spain. Thus this domestic policy of the fallen dynasty which for seventeen years degraded our national dignity, threatened also peace and our liberal alliances by its claims to a second crown in Madrid. The Republic has no ambitions and no nepotism to serve: it does not inherit a family claim. Let Spain rule itself, let it be independent and free. France, to cement this natural alliance, trusts rather to common principles than the successions of the house of Bourbon.

Such, Sir, is the mind of the Republic. Such will invariably be the character of the frank, strong and moderate policy you will represent.

At its birth, in the heat of a struggle unsought by the people, the Republic pronounced three words which revealed its soul and will call to its cradle the blessings of God and man: *Liberty*, *Equality*, *Fraternity*. The next day, by abolishing the political death-penalty, it gave the true commentary on these words at home; do you give them the true commentary abroad.

The meaning of these three words applied to our foreign relations is this: To free France from the chains which weighed down her principle and her dignity; to recover her proper rank among the European great powers; to make a declaration, finally, to all nations of alliance and friendship. If France is aware of her part in the liberal and civilising mission of the century, not one of these words means *war*. If Europe is wise and just, there is not one that does not mean *peace*.

I am, Sir, etc.,

LAMARTINE,

Minister of Foreign Affairs.

81 DECREE ABOLISHING SUB-CONTRACTING.

FRENCH REPUBLIC.

Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.

ON the report of the Government Commission for the workers, Considering,

(1) That labour too much prolonged not only ruins the workers' health, but also, by preventing him from training his intellect, attacks the dignity of man.

(2) That the exploitation of workers by working sub-contractors, called *marchandeurs* or *tacherons*, is essentially unjust, vexatious and contrary to the principles of fraternity.

The Provisional Government of the Republic decrees:

1 The working day is diminished by one hour. Consequently, in Paris, where it was eleven,[1] it is reduced to ten, in the provinces, where it was twelve, it is reduced to eleven.

2 The exploitation of workers by sub-contractors, or *marchandage*,[2] is abolished.

[1] *i.e.*, the *customary* working day
[2] "Letting out" work.

It is clearly understood that associations of workers which have not as their object the exploitation of workers by each other, are not considered as *marchandage*.

Paris, March 2nd, 1848.

DUPONT (de l'Eure), ARAGO, ALBERT CREMIEUX, FLOCON, GARNIER PAGÈS, LAMARTINE, LOUIS BLANC, MARRAST, MARIE[1]

General Secretary, PAGNERRE.

82 E. THOMAS: PROPOSALS ON NATIONAL WORKSHOPS.

EXTRACT FROM THE PROPOSAL OUTLINED BY M. EMILE THOMAS TO THE COUNCIL HELD BY M. GARNIER-PAGÈS AT THE HÔTEL DE VILLE, MARCH 5.

* * * Hence I propose, gentlemen, to establish, in a district far enough removed from the great centres of population to relieve us of any anxiety, an administration intended to centralize the action of the twelve municipalities concerning the workers. On a date fixed in advance each municipality will send us its workers, bearing their tickets, the single but indispensable condition of admission. Having written down their names, professions and residence we shall hand them a card, for use for the various verifications which we shall employ in each case, and which they will be unable to evade. We shall then classify them in brigades made up of a fixed number of men: these brigades will be divided into companies, each directed by one of our young comrades;[2] a system of radiation based on these principles and using the brigade as unit will permit of regular payment, in kind or in coin, at fixed hours, under salutary inspection and in accordance with the individual time-sheet of each worker.

On the other hand, Sir,[3] we shall each day make known apart from the division of the public works of Paris, the number of workers of each profession at the disposition of the new workshops opened as to meet the needs of the government. Also, we shall each day send to Paris or the departments the workers demanded of us for any given job. Our young instructors will go with them. In work for which the General Council of Roads and Bridges is responsible, the direction will be in the hands of the engineers of that body, while our officers will be content with the modest, though useful, duty of maintaining order and attention to duty * * *

Finally, capitalists, manufacturers, and business men who need employees, will approach us and arrange individually with the workers instead of searching for them at the *grève*.[4]

[1] A later decree (March 21) fixed the penalty for *marchandage*—a fine from 50 to 200 francs and six months' imprisonment on the third conviction.
[2] Of the École Centrale.
[3] M. Marie, Minister of Public Works.
[4] Place for hiring workers, corresponding in a way to our Labour Exchange. Cf. No. 87.

In one word, the institution that I suggest, is that of a universal free Labour Exchange, which for this exceptional period will also centralise the relief distributed by the municipalities. In any case, this bureau will classify the workers on its register by trades and will in point of fact cause them to meet according to their municipal *arrondissement*,[1] so as to avoid contact and thus combination between workers of the same trade, which in certain trades might lead to grave inconvenience if not danger.

83 COMMITTEE OF THE LUXEMBOURG ASSEMBLY, CHOSEN MARCH 10[2]

P. Pointard, button-maker,
L. Perrin, gunsmith,
J. Davoine, spurmaker,
P. Barré, carriage painter,
J. C. Legros, house carpenter,
G. Bernard, blacksmith,
C. Brémond, shawl-weaver,
J. B. M. Hobry, cooper,
X. Chagniard, iron-moulder,
N. A. M. Labrat, slater,
[J. J. Louis Blanc, President of the Assembly.]

1848 March 17: Blanquist deputation to the Government persuaded to retire by Blanc.

84 PROGRAMME OUTLINED BY LOUIS BLANC TO THE COMMISSION[3] OF THE LUXEMBOURG ON MARCH 20

CITIZENS, we have now to consider the greatest problem of modern times. We have called upon men of all opinions and of the greatest enlightenment obtainable, in order that our work of justice should be begun in impartiality.

At the minute the evil is very great: for that very reason the need of a remedy is felt the more strongly. The business men are saying "Here is the end! Not only the monarchy, society itself is disappearing." On the other hand the workers are disturbed by uneasy thoughts, and many refuse to submit to the old conditions of labour. What is to be done?

[1] District.
[2] Chosen by lot from the Assembly, but members of those trades which were represented twice withdrew in favour of others. The Committee was to represent the Assembly when it was not sitting, and on any point affecting a given trade to consult the delegates of that trade.
[3] This is not to be confused with the Committee above. This was a special commission of ten employers' and ten workers' delegates, *plus* an unspecified number of unattached experts and theorists. I have selected this from the reports of the Assembly, as it seems typical, but it is essential that Louis Blanc's volume *La Révolution au Luxembourg* should be read *in extenso* to gain any idea of the character and proceedings of the "Socialist Parliament." The employers' delegates were selected by a parallel Assembly of 231 employers which Louis Blanc had called. It seems, however, to have taken no further action: when the "Luxembourg" is mentioned by contemporary writers, the workers' Assembly is always meant.

Here is our proposal.

To the business men who find themselves to-day faced with disaster and come to us to say: "Let the State take our establishments and step into our shoes," we reply, "The State consents. You shall be generously recompensed. But this recompense, which is your due, cannot be taken from the insufficient resources we have to our hand: hence the State will issue to you bonds bearing interest and creating a mortgage upon the value of these very establishments, to be repayable by annuities or by redemption."

After this arrangement with the owners of workshops, the State will say to the workers: "Henceforward you will work in these workshops as brothers in association. To fix your wages, you have the choice of two systems, equal or unequal payment. We, for our own part, favour equality, because equality is a principle of order that excludes hatred and jealousy."

The objection may be raised: "Equality takes no account of varying aptitudes." We reply that if the hierarchy of administration is regulated by these aptitudes, they are not required to determine differences in payment. Superior intelligence gives no more claim than superior physical force: it only creates a duty. He who can do more, it is his duty to do more: there lies his privilege.

Again the objection may be made: "Equality destroys emulation." Nothing is truer in any system where everyone thinks only of himself, where the workers are simply an aggregation of units, act only from a purely individualist standpoint and have no reason to establish among themselves what I shall call WORK AS A POINT OF HONOUR. But who can fail to see that among workers in association idleness would soon seem as infamous as cowardice does to soldiers under arms? In every workshop a notice should be posted with this inscription: *In an association of brothers who work, every idler is a thief.*

In favour of equality of remuneration we add this consideration, in our eyes, decisive. Since election alone is to choose the directors of the work, equality of pay prevents the candidatures which, given inequality of pay, avarice would have motived. Competent men alone will then seek the most difficult task: any sordid ambition will be eliminated beforehand and classification by talents will follow.

In any case, whichever system prevails, there follows the question of the use of the profits of the common work.

After the wage bill, the interest on capital, the expenditure on establishment and material have been met, the profit will be thus divided:

One quarter to repay the capital of the proprietor with whom the State has dealt;

One quarter to the establishment of a fund to assist old men, invalids, injured, etc.;

One quarter to be divided among the workers as profit, as will be explained later;

One quarter, finally, to form a reserve fund for purposes which will be explained later

Thus will be constituted a workshop association. We shall then have to extend this association over all the workshops in the same industry and connect them up with each other. Two conditions will suffice:

Firstly, the net cost must be determined: allowing for the situation in the industrial world we shall fix the legitimate amount of profit permissible above the net cost, so as to arrive at a uniform price and prevent competition between the workshops of the same industry.

Secondly, in all workshops shall be fixed a rate of wages not identical but proportionate to the difference in the cost of living over all France.

Solidarity within the trade thus established, we should have next to realise the sovereign condition of order, which will make hate, wars, and revolutions for ever impossible; we should have to lay the bases of solidarity between all the different industries, between all the members of society.

For this, there are two indispensable conditions.

To add up the sum of the profits of all industries and divide it up among all the workers.

Then, to form from the various funds of which we spoke just now, a fund for mutual assistance among all industries, so that one which is in difficulties one year will be assisted by one which is prosperous. Hence we shall form a huge capital belonging to no individual but to all collectively.

The allocation of this capital would be entrusted to a council of administration placed at the head of all the workshops. In its hands would be the reins of all the industries, while to an expert nominated by the State would be given the direction of each particular industry.

The State will realise this by successive measures. No one will be violently treated. The State will give its model: beside it will live the private companies, the present economic system. But our scheme we believe will be so elastic, that in a little while, it is our firm belief it will extend itself over the whole of society, engulfing rival systems within itself in virtue of its irresistible power of attraction. It will be like a stone thrown into the water, and making circles which rise one out of the other and always grow larger.

Such is a rapid sketch of the project before you for discussion.

85 EMILE THOMAS: CONVERSATIONS WITH M. MARIE

From the *Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux*, p. 142-145 sqq.

M. MARIE explained to me on March 20th what I have already observed: That M. Louis Blanc had desired to impose upon the Provisional Government the creation, for his own advantage, of a Ministry of Labour and Progress, in virtue of his reputation among the workers. That the Government was still sufficiently energetic to refuse this claim, behind which it saw clearly both the dictatorship of this man and the complete and immediate upheaval of the social order, yet was unable to do otherwise than accord him the foundation of the Commission for the workers, where he could disorganise labour only in intention and not in fact.

Also M. Marie told me that the definite intention of the Government was to permit this *experience*,[1] that in itself it could only have a good result since it would prove to the workers themselves all the inanity and falsity of these inapplicable theories, and cause them to perceive their disastrous consequences for themselves. That, enlightened for the future, their idolatry of M. Louis Blanc would collapse of itself and he would so lose all his prestige, all his force, and cease to be at all a danger * * *

On March 23rd M. Marie summoned me to the Hôtel de Ville. After the meeting of the Government I went there and received the news that a credit of five millions had been opened for the National Workshops and that henceforward financial operations would be easier.

Then M. Marie took me aside and asked in a whisper whether I could rely on the workers.

"I think so," I replied, "yet the number is growing so that it is very difficult for me to have over them as direct an influence as I could wish."

"Never mind about the number," said the Minister; "if you have them in hand it can never be too great, but find a way of attaching them sincerely to you. Do not spare money, if need be, we will even allow you a secret fund."

"I do not think I shall need it; in the future that might be a source of considerable difficulties; however, what object, other than public calm, have your recommendations?"

"Public safety. Do you think you can manage to command your men altogether? It may be that the day is near when it will be necessary to march them into the streets."

"You will be the judge of that, Minister" * * *

M. Marie, on leaving me [on March 28th], again insisted on the necessity of having the workers entirely at my disposal on a given day. He inquired if they were armed and told me that it was necessary to see that they were, and that if necessary he would arrange the means for me.

1848. March 31. Publication of the pièce Taschereau (a document impugning Blanqui's honesty). This implies the Government has set itself in opposition to him.

86-87 CONCILIATION AWARDS ISSUED BY THE LUXEMBOURG COMMISSION.[2]

86 ZINC PLUMBERS: Convention between the Masters and Workers (undated, of late March).

BETWEEN the delegates of the working zinc plumbers of the one part and Messrs. Fontaine, Seiffert, Renaudot, Letalec and Marie, Junior, of the other, who have met together at the Luxembourg under the presidency of the General Secretary of the Government Commis-

[1] The National Workshops.

[2] The published awards (Appendix to Louis Blanc's *Pages d'Histoire*—there were undoubtedly many others, see Blanc *op. cit.* p. 323) deal with: Engineers (Derosne and Cail), Bakers (general strike, March 3), Wall paperers (ditto, April 1), Paviors (strike of the employees of the five Paris companies, March 31), ship-breakers (Port des Invalides, left bank of the Seine, May 1), Cabmen (April 13), farriers (April 7), Plumbers (undated), Stonemasons (April 29), Scavengers (April 4).

sion for the Workers, the following has been amicably agreed upon between all the interested parties:

(1) The working day remains as before, viz., Sunrise to sunset in winter; in summer, ten hours of actual work.

(2) The day's pay in winter as in summer is fixed at a minimum of 5 francs for a journeyman and 3 francs for a boy.

(3) Nightwork to be paid double.

(4) No journeyman may work more than the full day.

(5) One franc per day is allowed for travelling expenses to men and boys working outside the walls.

(6) *Marchandage*, even personal, is forbidden.[1]

(7) Wages shall be paid every fortnight at least.

(8) No owner may have more than one apprentice.

(9) Apprentices after one year's work shall be paid at journeyman's rates.

(10) Owners are expressly forbidden to hire journeymen who present themselves at the works, nor may any journeyman so hire himself.

(11) Journeymen and boys may only be hired at the *Grève* (place of hiring); masters have the right to hire a particular journeyman, by personal interview, by letter or by the intermediary of a comrade.

(12) Masters are urgently requested to send any complaints against journeymen or boys to the *Grève* in order that their demands may be met.

(13) Every journeyman from the *Grève*, having a card, can only be hired on presentation of said card.

(14) All masters and journeymen are urgently requested to notify to the *Grève* any infractions of the present agreement.

(15) From April 1st, 1848, the *Grève* is and remains fixed at the house of M. Durand, wine merchant, 69, rue Quincampoix.

Signed,

SEIFFERT, RENAUDOT, BERTRAND, MARIE, FONTAINE, LEMOYNE, LETALEC.

87 PAVIORS: Convention between Masters and Workers.

BETWEEN the delegates of the Masters and working paviors, meeting at the Luxembourg on April 1st, 1848, under the presidency of the General Secretary of the Government Commission for the workers,[2] the following was agreed upon, to the satisfaction of all parties:

From April 1st, 1848, the rates of wages shall be as follows:

Journeymen occupied in re-levelling pavements: 4 francs 50 centimes minimum.

Journeymen occupied in re-paving, 3 francs 75 centimes minimum.

Boys, 2 francs 50 centimes minimum.

Approved by all the interested parties,

NOLLÉ, SERINGUIN,[3] FRANCASTEL, JAROUX.[4]

[1] See p. 197.
[2] M. Vidal. Vidal never countersigned the awards, as Louis Blanc and Albert did if they were present.
[3] Workers' delegates.
[4] Employers, representing the 5 Paviors of Paris, Lesieur, Terwaigne, Francastel, Guerin and Jaroux

88 ELECTION PLACARD OF THE LUXEMBOURG.

(Of the First Days of April.)

THE
WORKING-MEN DELEGATES
OF THE LUXEMBOURG
TO THEIR CONSTITUENTS.

Citizens,

LIBERTY under the old regime was the exclusive property of the bourgeoisie, and thus we could hardly outline in the dark a few attempts at organisation. The Revolution surprised us, and, at the most, we have barely enough time to ensure the triumph of democracy at the coming elections. Your delegates, sent by you to the Luxembourg to decide in concert with the Government the important question of the organisation of labour, have met in a special session to consider the establishment of an executive committee and means of centralizing the popular forces, till now isolated. Although the bourgeoisie is feeble to-day, yet, as for fifty years it has had the monopoly of the Press, of public speaking, and the exclusive right of meeting and forming associations, it could yet dominate us by acting *en masse* and concentrating its votes on certain names at the day of the general elections. We desire to believe that reaction has abandoned all designs upon liberty, but the most certain means of thwarting these plots and assuring the triumph of the Revolution is instantly to give ourselves a UNIFIED ORGANISATION. Your delegates do not think that they are exceeding the limits of the power you have conferred upon them in initiating this organisation. The grave circumstances extend our mandate; nor should we have done our duty unless we had risen to them.

Herewith we give the Regulation by which we have constituted ourselves the Central Workers' Committee.

CONSTITUTIVE REGULATION OF THE CENTRAL WORKERS' COMMITTEE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE SEINE.

1. Among the delegates of the divers trades is formed a Committee entitled *Central Workers' Committee of the Department of the Seine.* Professions which have not yet named delegates are requested to do so at once.

2. The number of delegates is fixed at 3 per industry.

3. Each trade is invited to form within itself a committee in charge of the particular interests of the profession. By means of the delegates this committee will be in continual communication with the central committee, whose decisions it will publish and execute.

4. Each profession is invited to impose upon itself a monthly contribution, of which it will itself fix the amount and means of collection, to pay for the office expenses, printing, publications, etc., of the central committee. The funds will rest in the hands of the delegates, who will hold them continually at the disposal of the committee.

5. The aims of the central committee are:

(1) To assure the maintenance of the popular Republic by giving centralisation and a common aim to workers hitherto isolated.

(2) To assure the triumph of democracy in the elections, by careful examination of the candidates and by giving its recommendation to those who seem to it trustworthy.

(3) To prepare the organisation of labour, particularly by the serious study of the technical processes of each industry and the classification of the industries which are mutually indispensable for the making of a finished product.

6. The central committee will send to all departments circulars inviting the workers to organise in the same manner. For this purpose each trade is invited to send to the central committee the addresses of its provincial correspondences.[1]

[*There follows the procedure to be adopted by each trade for selecting candidates and sending their names for approval.*]

On behalf of the Central Workers' Committee of the Seine Department (Delegates of the Luxembourg).

The Members of the Provisional Bureau.

PARMENTIER, Louis Simon, compositor, President.

BÉNARD, Louis, silversmith.
DUMONT, Victor, typefounder.
LAVOYE, Louis, engineer.
} Vice Presidents.

FERRET, hairdresser.
LEFORT, Alphonse François, cobbler.
PETIT, file-cutter.
PAILLARD, bookbinder.
} Secretaries.

1848 April 16: National Guard and men from the National Workshops break up a demonstration of Socialists.

1848 April 23: Complete defeat of the Socialists at the elections.

89 E. THOMAS: WORKSHOP REGULATIONS.[2]

FRENCH REPUBLIC
NATIONAL WORKSHOPS.

Regulations for parade.

1. Parade in the various *arrondissements* will be held in the order and at the hour mentioned in an order of the day to be sent to the Town Halls.

[1] Later, on the meeting of the Assembly, Proudhon demanded that a network of proletarian committees—Soviets, we might say—should be constituted to fight it. (*Représentant du Peuple*, May 5):—

" Let a provisional committee be set going in Paris for the organisation of exchange, credit, and circulation between the workers;

" Let this committee enter into relations with similar committees established in the principal towns.

" By the action of these committees, let a representation of the workers be formed, an *imperium in imperio*, in face of the bourgeois representation;

" Let the germ of the new society be sown in the midst of the old society;

" Let the Charter of the workers be put first on the agenda and the principal provisions defined with the least possible delay;

" Let the bases of the Republican Government be decided and special powers given for this purpose to the workers' mandatories * * *

P. J. PROUDHON."

[2] Undated, a few days later than April 17.

2. No parade is held on Sundays and national festivals.
3. To be present on parade a worker must:
(1) Prove to his municipality that he is over 16 unless he has lost his father or is the eldest of a family of six.
(2) Present himself at the hour and time indicated for his *arrondissement* with a ticket having his name, profession, address, the stamp of his municipality and dated at least from the day before the parade.

* * * * * * * * *

8. Brigadiers and chiefs of squads are elected beforehand by the workers; but their brigade or squads may be taken to fill up the incomplete units of the same district. Their nomination is only final after parade.

* * * * * * * * *

The Commissary of the Republic.
Director of the National Workshops.

EMILE THOMAS

1848 April 27: Disturbance at Rouen. National Guard shoots down workers.

90 A. BARBÈS: PLACARD, ISSUED APRIL 29, CONCERNING THE ROUEN MASSACRES.

Society of the Rights of Man and the Citizen.

The Society's aims are:—

(1) To defend the rights of the people, restored to them by the revolution of February;

(2) To draw from this Revolution all its social consequences. As basis, we take the *Declaration of the Rights of Man* as formulated by Robespierre in 1793.[1]

Hence in politics, we believe in the Republic, *one* and *indivisible*, and the *inalienable* rights of the sovereign people. In social matters we hold that the old Constitution is destroyed and that which is destined to take its place must be based on *equality*, *solidarity* and *fraternity* as the fundamental bases of the social contract.

Consequently, in the social revolution which is beginning the Society of the Rights of Man for the minute places itself between the *pariahs* and the *privileged* of the old society. To the former we say: Be united, but calm: there lies your strength; so great is your number, that it will be enough for you to shew your will to gain what you desire: it is also so great that you can only desire what is just: your voice and your will are the voice and the will of God.

To the others we say: The ancient form of society has passed away, the reign of privilege and exploitation is over. If in the old form of society you had acquired your privileges in a legal manner, do not rely on that fact, since

[1] See Chapter I, Sect. ii, Nos. 5 and 17, pp. 30 and 43.

those laws were your own creation. The great majority of your brothers knew nothing of them and hence need not respect them.

Therefore join with us: you have need of the pardon of those you have so long sacrificed. But if now, in spite of this promised pardon, you persist in isolating yourselves and defending the old form of society, you will meet, in the day of battle, our organised sections in the vanguard; and your brothers will speak to you then, not of *pardon*, but of *justice*.

The Members of the Central Committee.

L. J. VILLAIN, NAPOLEON LEBON,
A. HUBER, V. CHIPRON, A. BARBÈS.[1]

1848 May 13: Last session of the Luxembourg Commission.

91 DOCUMENTS PREPARED FOR ISSUE IN THE EVENT OF THE SUCCESS OF THE REVOLT OF MAY 15.

A. PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT[2]

RASPAIL[3]
BLANQUI[4]
LOUIS BLANC
BARBÈS[5]
LEDRU ROLLIN
CAUSSIDIÈRE
SOBRIER[6]
HUBER[7]
CABET[8]

B. SEVEN DECREES[9]

FIRST DECREE. The Committee of Public Safety.

In the name of the people, founder of the Republic in February and May, 1848, the Committee of Public Safety declares:

That the National Assembly, being largely composed of reactionaries, has violated its mandate;

That it has wasted valuable time when our poverty demanded instant measure;

[1] Barbès was not a member of the Central Committee; hence his signature gave the more astonishment, and as he was Colonel of the 12th Division of the National Guard and the most important club leader next to Blanqui, this placard caused considerable agitation.
[2] List found on J. Thomas.
[3] A club nominee, of the Friends of the People.
[4] Also a club nominee, of the Central Republican Society
[5] President of the Club of the Revolution.
[6] On the Committee of the "Club of Clubs."
[7] Member of the Society of the Rights of Man. Letters were produced at the trial in 1849 to prove that he was in 1838 a police agent. These were not, owing to Huber's absence, carefully investigated, and the question remains unsolved.
[8] Of the Central Fraternal Society. The Utopian Socialist. Another list was found written upon a blackboard at the Hôtel de Ville. This omitted Sobrier and Huber and substituted Albert, Thoré, Leroux and Flocon.
[9] Found at Sobrier's lodgings.

That it has refused to create a Ministry of Labour; * * *

That it has seized the power of oppression by leaving troops in Paris and giving the president the right to call on them and on all the National Guards in France;

That it has attacked the liberty and sovereignty of the people, proclaimed on the barricades in February, by forbidding the people, by a law, to present petitions itself.

That, finally, it has fired upon the people, which came peaceably to present a petition in favour of the Poles.

Consequently,

The people of Paris, our vanguard and sentinel, has undertaken to watch the execution of the mandates given to the representatives, and, perceiving them violated, declares the representatives excluded from all power and has appointed a Committee of Public Safety, of nine members, viz., Citizens .....[1]

This Committee is invested with unlimited powers to take all measures for the constitution and organisation of a truly democratic Republic, and the most energetic repression of reaction if it dares to appear again.

The Members of the Committee of Public Safety.

SECOND DECREE.

[*Pardon for past opponents. Forbiddance of emigration.*]

THIRD DECREE.

[*Suppression of municipal and other authorities. Meetings of the people to elect substitutes for them. The National Guard forbidden to appear in public. Its place to be taken by a Workers' Guard, to be organised.*]

FOURTH DECREE.

The Committee of Public Safety.

* * * decrees,

(1) Capitalists, known to be such by the Municipal Committee, shall pay, within five days from the demand to be addressed to them, the sum of 200 francs per 1,000 francs of income, commonly known to be theirs—over and above 1,500 francs of income for each member of the household over 15 years of age—up to the sum of 3,500 francs. From 3,500 to 5,000 francs, 250 francs shall be paid, and such progressive increases shall continue up to one-half of the income.

(2) Within the same period every landed proprietor who pays over 100 francs and below 250 in land tax must pay in addition 25 francs per 50 francs of land tax. From 250 francs to 1,000 he shall pay 100 per 50 francs; from 1,000 to 5,000, 150 per 50 francs; above 5,000, 200 per 50 francs.

[(3) *and* (4) *arrangements for collecting it.*]

(5) Upon receipt of the earliest contributions a distribution shall at once be made to the necessitous, of 3 francs per family of 3 persons and 8 francs per family of 6 persons * * *

(6) The Workers' Guard is entrusted with maintenance of order.

[1] Not filled up. See previous Document.

(7) Any citizen found drunk will be imprisoned and fed only on soup, bread and water.

FIFTH DECREE. [*Lost.*]

SIXTH DECREE.

[*Communes in all France to be called to recognise the Republic.*]

SEVENTH DECREE.

A decree upon the organisation of labour, upon a basis which is actually realisable, will be promulgated within three weeks. It will be entirely in the interest of the workers, while safeguarding, as far as possible, the just rights of the master.

92 DECREES ACTUALLY ISSUED BY BARBÈS DURING HIS ONE-HOUR OCCUPATION OF THE HÔTEL DE VILLE, MAY 15

A. The people having dissolved the National Assembly, there remains no power but that of the People itself.

Consequently, the People having shewn its desire to have for Provisional Government Citizens Louis Blanc, Albert, Ledru Rollin, Barbès, Raspail, Pierre Leroux and Thoré,[1] these citizens are named members of the Commission of Government.

Citizen Caussidière is retained as delegate of the Republic at the prefecture of Police.

The National Guard is ordered to return to its quarters.

Signed,

A. BARBÈS and ALBERT.

B. FRENCH REPUBLIC, PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT.

Mayor of Paris.

The Provisional Government, observing the desire of the people, declares that it will immediately convey to the Russian and German governments the order at once to reconstitute Poland; and, if these governments fail to comply the Government of the Republic will at once declare war upon them.

ARMAND BARBÈS.

1848 May 24: Orders sent to M. Thomas conscribing workers of the National Workshop.

1848 May 26: Thomas kidnapped.

[1] This is Barbès' revision of the original list. "And Blanqui?" he was asked. "Do not dare to mention Blanqui to me," he replied, and scratched the name out. The first three names are those of public men, members of the original Provisional Government, the last four are club nominees, viz.:—

Barbès—Club of the Revolution,
Raspail—Friends of the People,
Leroux—Club of the Revolution,
Thoré—Club of the Revolution—

resigned from Blanqui's Central Republican Society. Raspail's club had generally 4,000 attenders, but was very loosely knit.

93 DECREE ON THE WORKSHOPS PREPARED FOR MAY 24, ISSUED JUNE 21

From Émile Thomas' *Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux*, pp. 271, 343.

"On the morning of the 24th May, I received an order from the Minister, couched in the following terms:—

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Executive Commission has adopted the following measures concerning the National Workshops:

(1) Unmarried workers aged from 18 to 25, will be invited to enlist beneath the flag of the Republic in order to replenish the various regiments.

The names of those who refuse to enlist voluntarily will be at once struck from the rolls of the National Workshops.

(2) A census shall at once be taken of the workers in Paris. This shall be undertaken concurrently by the *mairies*[1] and the employees of the National Workshops who are delegated for this purpose.

All workers who cannot formally prove residence in Paris for six months before May 24th will be dismissed and cease to receive pay and assistance.

(3) The lists of workers, drawn up according to locality and profession, shall be deposited in a bureau situated as far as possible in the centre of Paris, where their contents will be made known to employers by the employees of the Administration. Employers may requisition any number of workers that they declare necessary to recommence or continue their business. Any workers who refuse to go will be instantly struck off the general list of the National Workshops.

(4) Workers who are not excluded by the preceding articles and who, for the minute, will continue to form part of the National Workshops, will be paid by the piece and not the day.[2]

(5) With the least possible delay brigades of workers will be organised and directed to the departments to be employed in the execution of great public works under the direction of the Engineers of Bridges and Roads.[3]

I hope, Sir, that you will carry into effect, as swiftly as may be, these decisions of the Executive Commission * * *

On behalf of the Minister of Public Works,

By Order,

BOULAGE,

General Secretary."

* * * Finally, on the 21st of June, the *Moniteur* issued this decree, which had been held up for a month * * * And as if this were not a sufficient provocation, M. Lalanne[4] while completing these intelligent reforms, sup-

[1] Similar to London "Boroughs."
[2] In view of the absence of any available work, this article meant practical starvation.
[3] Government Engineers. The "works" were draining the unhealthy marshes of Cologne
[4] Thomas' successor.

pressed also the bureau for giving assistance to the needy, augmented by 50 per cent. the price of the products of the shoemakers' and tailors' workshops,[1] giving this measure a retrospective character which was grossly unjust * * * He suppressed the medical service and gave orders to all the foremen to stop all work at their shops immediately."

94 PROPHECY OF DAYS OF BLOOD[2]

By Citizen Louis Pujol. Μανθη Κακων[3]

I.

VERILY I say unto you, People: I am the Prophet of misfortune. They that have ears let them hear the tale of the evils that threaten our country. They that have the tongue of truth, let them go about the cities and the countryside repeating the prophecy of the quarrels which soon will bathe in blood the flag of civil war.

II.

God hath said to the blast of his wrath: Go forth! His iniquity has reached its height.

And the blast of the wrath of God hath swept away a crown.

And the people who groaned beneath the whip of Tarquin rose brandishing the sword of justice.

And all those who had beaten it beneath the reign of oppression, bowed before it as courtiers and said unto it, King!

And it replied to the accomplices of the Tyrant who were trembling at its feet: Arise! Are ye not my brothers? Come! the blood of Abel shall not tarnish my glory.

And in the dust they heard the voice of pity.

And they arose to embrace the people, but the people knew that this was the kiss of Judas!

And a smile of disdain passed over its burning lips.

And its face grew strained with sorrow, as the face of a man who hath in his hands a dagger yet hath horror of death.

And its crying voice let forth some words of pity which froze the hearts of them that had betrayed it.

And they remembered their defeat and shook with fear.

And they called to their aid men armed with lances and with muskets, men subtle in warfare.

And in place of the mercy of the people did these men utter against it cries of persecution and war.

And behold, men who had long suffered in the dark cells and mysterious caverns of Royalty spoke to the people of those who would enchain it.

[1] Which had been sold to employees at cost price.
[2] No date. See the *Bulletin* of the Soc. d'histoire de la Rév. de 1848, I, 133.
[3] This should be Μάντις κακῶν—"prophet of evil."

And even they who instructed the people have been strangled as criminals, hunted to their dens like wild beasts and pitilessly thrown into prison.

And even now are they there, lying on damp stones, brave martyrs who await the hour of their new deliverance.

Behold wherefore I prophecy unto you, that the time to come hideth many bloody mysteries.

Woe unto you who walk blindfold! Ye see not the abyss that shall swallow you!

Verily I say unto you: All crimes will receive their punishment.

They have come to you with confidence, ye have sent them away with contempt.

They arose before you to shew the wound of their poverty, and ye have not healed it, but have poisoned it with the deadly weapon of slander.

They have lifted the menacing voice of hunger and ye have closed your ears.

They have said unto you: We have the right to live by labour, and ye have answered them: We have the right to let you die, or ye shall work as we desire.

Again they said: By our blood we have redeemed our freedom, we will remain free; And ye said unto them: ye shall again be slaves.

They spoke to you of justice and ye have shewn them insults and bayonets!

Then went they to and fro telling the tale of their evil hap.

And armed men pursued their victims night and day and scattered them with the sword.

And these men, being persecuted as evil doers because they desired justice, said one to another: Behold, we are again proscribed and outcasts and branded with the brand of Cain! Was it this that we were promised on the day of victory? Others have founded their dream of tyranny upon the division of the people and when the people rose like one man thrones were broken and crowns scattered by the breath of its anger.

And therefore it is that our oppressors continue the rule of sword and despotism!

And therefore it is that we have changed one master for many!

And therefore it is that they hope to keep for the children of the people the days of sorrow, for themselves the banquets and the drunkenness of gold!

And therefore also it is that we unite again to proclaim the rights of man violated by our unworthy rulers and to pound in our mortar the power of men of blood and exploitation!

Liberty, liberty, thou wilt rise radiant from the storm of revolution as the sun which brings back peace and fruitfulness. The martyrs, who glorify themselves by dying for thee, will be praised before thy altars in songs of triumph, and their victorious names be graven in golden letters on the porch of the temple of Immortality!

LOUIS PUJOL.

95 LUXEMBOURG AND WORKSHOPS: JOINT PLACARD OF JUNE 18

FRENCH REPUBLIC
TO ALL WORKERS.

WE, the workers' delegates to the Luxembourg, we the delegates of the National Workshops; we, devoted soul and body to the Republic, for which we fought like all the rest of you, we pray you, in the name of the *Liberty* you have so hardly won; in the name of the *Country* you have regenerated; in the name of *Fraternity* and *Equality:* do not add your voice and support to anarchic voices, do not give your arms and hearts to encourage the partisans of a *throne* that you have burnt! These soulless and unprincipled men will inevitably bring anarchy into the country, which needs only *work* and *liberty*.

Nobody henceforward must claim more than that noblest of all titles, *Citizen*. Nobody must attempt to struggle against the true sovereign, the *People*.

To attempt this would be an *execrable crime*, and whoever dared it would be a traitor to *honour* and the *country*.

Reaction is at work and moving, its many agents will dazzle your eyes, brothers, with an impossible dream, a meaningless happiness.

It scatters gold abroad. *Beware, friends, beware! Wait, wait but a few days more, with that calm you have so often shown and wherein lies your true strength.*

Have hope for the times have come; the future is ours; do not encourage by your presence demonstrations which are "popular" only in name; keep clear of these stupidities of a past age.

Believe us, listen to us: nothing is now possible in France but the SOCIAL AND DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC.[1]

The history of the last reign is terrible. Let it not be continued. There must be neither *emperor* nor *king*. Nothing but *Liberty*, *Equality* and *Fraternity*.

Such is our hope, such should be yours, the *People's*.

Vive la République!

PIERRE VINCARD, president of the workers' delegates at the Luxembourg—AUGUSTE BLUM, vice-President—JULIEN, treasurer—LEFAURE, secretary—BACON, President of the delegates of the workers of the National Workshops—EUGÈNE GARLIN, secretary—PETIT-BONNEAU, lieutenant—ARDILLON, ditto.

1848 June 23-26: Revolt of the proletariat.

[1] This document is taken from Thomas (*op. cit.*, p. 341). He does not say whether the italics are his, but from internal evidence I should judge that, with the possible exception of these three paragraphs, they are not. (I have not been able to discover any other copy of this placard except one in Blanc's *Histoire*, vol. ii., p. 136, which does not indicate the changes of type.)

96 INSURGENTS' PROCLAMATIONS

96A IN THE NAME OF THE SOVEREIGN PEOPLE[1]

CITIZENS,

ON the barricades of February the men to whom we gave the title Members of the Provisional Government promised us a Social and Democratic Republic; they promised and we, trusting in their word, abandoned our barricades. In four months, what have they done? They have broken their word and not fulfilled their promise.

We, Citizens on guard at the *mairie* of the 8th *arrondissement*,

Demand:

A social and democratic Republic;

Free association of Labour, aided by the State;

The impeachment of the Representatives of the People and of the ministers, and the immediate arrest of the Executive Commission;

We demand the removal of the troops from Paris.

Citizens, remember you are sovereign; remember our motto: *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.*

On behalf of the citizens on guard at the *mairie* of the 8th *arrondissement*.

J.-J. GUILLET.

96B PROCLAMATION OF JUNE 26.[2]

TO ARMS!

WE demand the Democratic and Social Republic! We demand the sovereignty of the People!

No citizen of a Republic could or should desire anything else.

To defend this Republic everyone's aid is needed.

The many democrats who have seen this necessity have for two days been out in the streets.[3]

Already this holy cause has many victims: we are all resolved to avenge these noble martyrs or to die. Awake! Citizens, let not one of us fail to answer the call.

In defending the Republic we defend property.

If blind obstinacy makes you indifferent to so much bloodshed we shall all die beneath the burning ruins of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine.[4]

Think of your wives and children, and you will come to us!

[1] Undated. Issued by the insurgents of the 8th *arrondissement*. Three Representatives (Larabit, Desvaux, Cazalat), who penetrated into the Faubourg Saint-Antoine, were asked to sign a document reading " (1) The National Assembly should be dissolved; (2) The army shall be withdrawn 120 miles from Paris ; (3) All the prisoners at Vincennes shall be liberated." [Vincennes was the prison for political offenders, in which was incarcerated, among others, Barbès.] (4) " The people itself will draw up its own Constitution."

[2] This was the only other announcement issued by the workers, except the mottoes on their flags: " *Bread or Lead*," "*Bread and Work or Death*," etc.

[3] *i.e.*, fighting.

[4] The last stronghold of the insurrection.

97-100 PROCLAMATIONS AND FACTS OF THE JUNE REVOLT

(97)

There were about a thousand prisoners in the narrow sub-terranean passage of the terrace by the water . . . The poisonous and unbreathable air in this cavern forced the prisoners to approach the ventilators to gain a breath of air Then the sentinels would shoot them through the openings . . . The dead and wounded fell down into bloody and pestilential mud which reached to the prisoners' ankles. An old man was brought among them, weeping, and saying that he was not a rebel and had come to Paris to see his son. Thereupon one National Guard shot him through the shoulder, another felled him with a second shot, and a third killed him with a third bullet, saying: "I can at least boast that I have shot a sparrow[1] in its cage." The body lay on the stairs for two hours.

* * * In another cellar the prisoners were piled on each other in a stifling heat, without bread or water. They complained: an officer walking up and down near the ventilator heard them. "Who is complaining?" he said. "We are hungry: let us have some bread." "Wait a moment."

He took the rifle of one of his supporters and fired through the ventilator. A prisoner fell. "Is anyone else hungry?" said the officer, grinning. "May I serve anybody?" LOUIS MÉNARD.[2]

[1] Shooting sparrows: a slang term for wasting powder.

[2] *Prologue d'une Révolution*, p. 275. This is indispensable for the history of the June days.

25th June.

(98)

Workers, and all who are yet in arms against the Republic, for the last time I exhort you, in the name of all that is respectable, holy and sacred to man, lay down your arms! The National Assembly, the whole nation asks it of you.

You have been told that cruel vengeance awaits you. Only your enemies, and ours, speak thus! You have been told you will be sacrificed in cold blood. Come to us, come as repentant brothers submitting to the law: the arms of the Republic are open to receive you!

The Head of the Executive Power,
E. CAVAIGNAC.

The President of the National Assembly,
SENARD.

26th June.

(99)

CITIZENS, SOLDIERS.

The cause of the Republic has triumphed: your loyalty and unshaken courage have discomfited guilty intentions, have done justice to fatal errors. In the name of the country, in the name of all humanity you are thanked for your efforts and blessed for this necessary victory.

This morning the emotion of the struggle was proper and inevitable. Now you must be as great in peace as you have just been in war. In Paris I see conquerors and conquered: may my name be accursed if ever I consent to see victims here.

Justice shall take its course: let it. That is my thought, and yours also.

Prepared to resume the rank of a simple citizen, I shall bear from among you the patriotic memory that never during these great trials did I take from freedom more than the actual safety of the Republic demanded, and left an example to any who may be called upon in their turn to fulfil such a serious task.

The Head of the Executive Power.

CAVAIGNAC.

(100)

"Prisoners were being shot in the plain of Grenelle, at the Montparnasse Cemetery, in the race-course of Montmartre. Prisoners were being shot in the Place du Panthéon. Prisoners were being shot at the Cloister of St. Benedict and in the court of the Hôtel de Cluny. A wounded rebel was stretched on a bed of straw. Some monsters fired it and burnt the dying man alive."

LOUIS BLANC.

1848 June 25: Old government resigns. Cavaignac has practically dictatorial power. State of siege continues.

101 FROM THE SPEECH OF LEDRU-ROLLIN ON FAMILY AND PROPERTY, IN THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY, AUGUST 25, 1848

* * * I said, the Red[1] Republic is a mere bogey. If you will listen to me for a few minutes, I hope to prove this. (*Hear, hear.*) Under this name you persecute particularly Socialism. Yet I am not afraid of Socialism. May I explain why? (*Laughter on the Right.*) I am not afraid, because it only signalises something to which my eyes have long been opened: the profound misery of society to-day. That its remedies are mistaken I agree.

But to show it its errors we must do something to give life again to the country. Not a new constitution: believe me, that is no remedy! We have enough constitutions among our laws to stock all the peoples of the world. (*Laughter.*) It is social institutions that we need * * *

May I tell you what I—and I think the country as a whole also—mean by the true Republic? It is not the name, not even universal suffrage: it is respect for the family, respect for property. Perhaps you think that the Red Republicans, as they are called, do not respect the family? Perhaps you believe that men whose every day is a day of suffering do not want that quiet joy, although the only pleasure they can find is at the family hearth? The family! We must be clear about that word. We want it, not for some, but for all. (*Hear, hear.*) That all may have their family, all must have work. For where is the family of the child brought up in the Foundling Hospital? Where is the family of the girl who cannot live by her work and must prostitute herself? Where is the

[1] *i.e.*, the Socialist Republic.

family of the worker who is almost forced to live in concubinage? Where is the family of the aged worker dying on the pallet-bed of a hospital? Where is the family for these? We wish the family to be universal. Never say we do not respect it; we do not wish to restrict it, but to extend and multiply it. (*Prolonged applause.*)

You speak of respect for property. Permit me to say this: that only fools fail to see that property is the first foundation of liberty. We demand property also: for we ask that the worker shall have either credit or the tools of his trade. We demand for all property, open and justified by labour, and, to start with, able to stand by itself. That is how we wish it. And perhaps we desire it more than you. Do you know why? It is because we say that there are means by which a great number of workers could become property-holders; that in this land of France there is a place in the sun for all; that you have commons to divide; that you have State domains which produce nothing and which individual labour would make profitable; that there is in France much clearing of lands to be done, and sterile wastes to be fertilized. Property could not be too much multiplied to please us * * *

So, we respect property, provided that, like the family, it is infinitely multiplied. And when we say this we interpret the great thought of the Convention. You know well that it demanded the dissemination of property. It was right to do so, for all republics—and here I am replying to certain socialist ideas—in ancient and mediæval times, have died through the concentration of property, for at the present moment that magnificent and giant land, America, is deeply alarmed by the concentration of property. (*Denials.*) You will understand that it is difficult for me to reply to objections that I cannot hear. I said, and I repeat, and I cannot be confuted by those who know perfectly well that it is true: In North America property is suffering by its very concentration: they demand not an agrarian law but the distribution of State lands: from one pole to another in that land they cry: *Land is Liberty!*[1]

Yes, we want property as we want the family; we want it for all; if not in land at least as the instrument of labour.[2]

1848 December: L. N. Bonaparte elected President.
1849 May 29: New reactionary Assembly elected.
1849 June 13: Riot led by Ledru-Rollin dispersed.
1851 December 2: Bonaparte's *coup-d'état.*

[1] In English in the original.

[2] Compare this extract from the speech of LEDRU-ROLLIN on September 22, 1848, at the banquet in honour of the foundation of the Republic:—

Is it Socialism when we say: No Republic without the Right to Work; for there is no sovereign people when the duty of society is charity? No! it is not Socialism, it is the Republic! Again, when we say: We must have institutions for Credit or else Capital by its usury devours the workers' labour—this is not Socialism, it is the Republic!

Yes, it is the Republic! And is it not because the enemies of the true Republic feel that, when it is thus rooted in the customs of the land, it can never be overthrown, that they try to deceive and exploit timidity in confusing two entirely different things, Socialism and the Republic in practice?

102 EXTRACTS FROM L. A. BLANQUI'S "CRITIQUE SOCIALE." WRITTEN 1869

IGNORANCE and communism are incompatible. General education without communism and communism without general education are equally impossible. The Communist is a man whom one cannot deceive or mislead. But every ignoramus is a dupe and a tool of deception, a slave and an instrument of enslavement.

* * * Every organism has its conditions of existence: outside of which it cannot live. Communism cannot be improvised because it will be the result of education which cannot be improvised either. Do not forget the race of beings which are chameleons as well as vampires. They would not disappear on the morrow of the Revolution any more than their native food, the race of the simple and silly.

* * * The old prison is still standing, black and menacing, with hardly two or three cracks which have allowed a few captives to escape, and already, like mother-hens when the little ducks they have hatched run into the water, the proprietors of the new revolution are in agonies about the unfortunate people who have escaped and are gambolling happily in the sun.

"Children, children! What foolishness. The fresh air will give you colds. Quick now! Come back to the beautiful palace I have built for you. Such a palace has never been seen before, never will be seen again."

Already there are more than one Moses who swear that they have built in lime and cement for eternity, and certainly the gates of hell will never prevail against these new Heavens for sale. Any believer is free to search through the darkness for a fugitive glimpse of the monument of the future. It is a very good object for a walk and an excellent exercise for the eyes. But to come back from your excursion with a complete and minute design of the building, plan, section, height, details, and authentic site, . . . no, my friend, no, put your drawing back in your pocket.

A harmless mania, though, if only these frantic lovers of imprisonment did not turn violently upon the destroyers of the old gaol, for refusing to labour at building up the new, and would let the public walk at its ease—an awful thought, according to all the Messiahs.

It is difficult to deny, before all this evidence,[1] that the inevitable crown of civilization is communism. The study of the past and the present shows that all progress is a step made in this direction, and the examination of the problems discussed to-day allows us to find no other reasonable solution. Everything is moving rapidly to this end: it only needs public education, that is, only our good-will. Hence communism is not a Utopia. It is a normal development and has no relation to the three or four systems that have sprung all armed from certain fantastical brains. Cabet, in his *Icarie* and his attempt at Nauvoo, made precisely this mistake of assimilating the real ideal of the future to the

[1] *i.e.*, the statements previously made in his work. Blanqui held that Society started with complete individualism and regularly evolves to communism.

floating hypotheses of the purveyors of reach-me-downs.[1] He was doomed to a heavier fall than his rivals, since communism is a result of general evolution and not an egg laid and hatched in a corner of the human race, by a bird with two legs, no wings and no feathers.

Saint-Simonians, Fourierists, Positivists all declared war on the Revolution, which they accused of incorrigible negativity. For thirty years their priests had announced to the universe, the end of the era of destruction and the coming of the organic period in the person of their particular Messiah Rival shopkeepers, these three sects agreed only in their fulminations against the revolutionaries, these hardened sinners who would not open their eyes to the light nor their ears to the word of life.

* * * * * * * * *

STEPS TO BE TAKEN FOR THE MOMENT.[2]

Economic

(1) Order to all heads of industry and commerce, under pain of expulsion from France to maintain for the minute *in statu quo* their present establishment, personnel and salariat. The State will make arrangements with them. Substitution of public authority [*régie*] for any employer expelled for refusal.

(2) Convocation of competent assemblies to regulate the question of the customs, the mines and the great industrial companies, credit and the means of exchange.

(3) An assembly charged with laying the foundation of workers' associations.

By the order to employers Capital's traitor-thrust would be parried. That is the essential point, at the first moment. Then the workers need not wait in the gutter for the new social measures.

Political.

Suppression of the Army and magistracy—Immediate dismissal of the upper and middle classes of officials. Provisional retention of employees—Expulsion of all the black army[3] male and female—all the movable and immovable property of the Churches, Orders and congregations of both sexes, and of those who have lent them the cover of their names, to be added to the domain of the State.

Recovery from the dangerous enemies of the Republic for acts[4] posterior to February 24th, 1848—Annulment of all sales of such goods or of any mortgage upon them, since the same date.

Re-organisation of official personnel—No more Penal Code or magistrates—Arbiters in civil cases, juries in criminal. The penalty to be in proportion to the crime and always dictated by the jury according to its conscience and not by any obligatory scale of punishments—The nature of the penalties alone to be determined in advance.

[1] "Pacotille."
[2] In the event of revolution.
[3] Religious Orders.
[4] Of peculation? or confiscation? This compared with next item seems not very clear

Formation of a sedentary[1] national army—General arming of the workers and republican populations. No liberty to the enemy.

Financial.

Suppression of the *grand livre* of the public debt—Commission to regulate the Savings Bank.

Replacing of all indirect and direct contributions by a direct and progressive tax on income and inheritances.

Public Instruction.

Constitution of a teaching body in three degrees; primary, secondary, tertiary.

Government.

Parisian dictatorship.

[1] *i.e.*, localised and not mobile.

Section II

Hungary 1848-1849

103 Summary of the Bill on the Magyar Tongue, February 29 1848
104 Six Points Moved by Kossuth, March 18 1848
105 The Hungarian Declaration of Independence, April 19 1849
106 Abdication of the Provisional Government, August 11 1849

Introduction

EVEN before the news of the French Revolution there had been considerable trouble in Hungary. The Hungarian Revolution was at all times bitterly Nationalist, and this was shown in its earliest manifestations, which may be traced in the agitation of Count Szechenyi for greater use of the Magyar language (cf. No. 103). This agitation, however, chiefly owing to the efforts of a journalist named Lajos or Louis Kossuth, took on very soon a larger aspect. Hungary was at this time in a condition not dissimilar from that of France in 1789. The peasants depended for their land and livelihood on the feudal regulations of Maria Theresa, the "urbarium" of 1765. Although these had in their origin been intended to protect the peasants, they were by now a serious encumbrance to them and were more particularly offensive to the gradually growing merchant class of Buda-Pesth. Of a real proletarian class there was as yet little to be seen, and of Communism nothing. All through its history this particular facet of the 1848 Revolution remained a bourgeois and peasant revolution, acting through the means of a national state to strictly national and limited ends. It did not at first desire to dispense with the Emperor of Austria, who was also King of Hungary; not even Kossuth showed his republicanism in the earlier stages of the Revolution. And all through his life he was an uncompromising anti-Socialist.

The news of the French Revolution quickened movement in Hungary as elsewhere. The Diet—which represented only the nobles—was already prepared with a demand for a Constitution which would have separated the Hungarian from the Austrian Ministry altogether. Nevertheless, in spite of this, it is very doubtful whether the Diet would have achieved anything had it not been for the Revolution in Vienna on March 13, 1848, which led to the fall of Metternich. Four days later the Emperor Ferdinand sanctioned the Hungarian Constitution, and immediately Kossuth induced the Diet to pass the six reforms which represent the tangible achievement of the Revolution (No. 104). Batthyanyi Lajos—Count Louis Batthyanyi—formed the first responsible Ministry.

As time went on, the agrarian, monarchical and nationalist character of the movement became more marked. The Ministry attempted to enforce the Hungarian language on the many subject-races in Hungary (No. 103), and in May a revolt of Rumanians, Serbs and Croats broke out. The revolutionary movement in the Slavonic districts was in origin similar to that of Hungary and might have been made good use of; indeed, in Bohemia it was at one time very menacing to the Emperor. But the bitter intolerance of the Magyars and the excellent diplomacy of the Court served to make the Czecho-Slovaks and the Croats, under Jellachich, the most pliant tools of reaction. When the revolutionary armies had been crushed, the Emperor, of course, withdrew all his concessions to the new Panslav movement. It should also be observed that the Hungarian movement retained its monarchical

character, since on July 23 troops were dispatched against Italy and the agitation of Perczel in Pesth for a Republic produced little effect, the strength of the movement lying in its rural supporters. Such an attitude could not, however, be maintained for long. In October the general decline of revolutionary forces in Europe, the fall of Milan, and the advance of the Croats induced the Emperor to annul the Constitution and declare Jellachich Military Dictator of Hungary. It soon became clear that Jellachich could not face the Hungarian armies. Three days later (October 6) troops were being dispatched to him from Vienna, when the Viennese people rose again in revolt—this time without the richer bourgeoisie, seized the town and prevented the dispatch of the troops.

Instant aid from the Hungarian army, now a large and disciplined body, would have upset the dynasty. But the monarchic prepossessions of its leaders caused them to delay until the Emperor's General had collected a huge force and Vienna was on the point of surrender. On the 30th, Vienna fell, and the Emperor at once attacked Hungary. In spite of initial defeats, it seemed as though the Hungarians might win, since in the spring of 1849 the Austrians were continually defeated. At last, in April of that year, the Hungarian Diet published its Declaration of Independence (No. 105), and placed a Republican, Kossuth, at the head of the Government. But Russian intervention and internal exhaustion proved too much for the Government; continual defeats and revolts occurred, until in August, 1849, the vain and loquacious Governor resigned his powers (No. 106) into the hands of a general whom he had himself once cashiered for incompetence, and who promptly surrendered at Villagos. General Haynau being present, the usual shootings and hangings followed.

* * * * * * * * *

That is as far as the cold documentary history goes. But it would be unfair to judge Kossuth and his followers by what they actually did, by Motions, Acts, Bills, and Regulations. The Hungarian Revolution must not be treated so sternly. It is a revolution led by a great actor. It is Cyrano de Bergerac's revolution. It is melodrama. The very names—Bem, Dembinski, Damianics, the Honveds and the black traitor's name, Görgei—read like an old adventure story. The sword of the Magyar was drawn against intolerable usurpation. He retained as long as man could his devotion to the Crown of St. Stephen. When, in October, 1848, the Hungarian army stopped on the banks of the Leitha and said that it would not cross into Austria to save Vienna until it received a formal invitation, signed and sealed, from the Diet, that the river was a boundary honour forbade it to cross, Marx denounces this as treachery. The words are too harsh: at the most it was, if you will, playing to the gallery. When Bem, at the head of 5,000 men, sets out to conquer Transylvania, and does so in one campaign, it is not dull, serious warfare, it is a wild Gascon raid.[1] The whole story of the rolling up of Jellachich's army, the defeat by

[1] Sometimes, of course, the note fails. When he announces the defeat of the Ban Jellachich in the Cæsarian words BEM BAN BUM (this is alleged to mean "Bem has defeated the Ban") he makes the step to the ridiculous.

wild and chivalrous horsemen of the Austrian armies, the finest in the world, is as fantastic as a play. It is a failure, not in historical insight, but in tact, to say "in such and such a way the Hungarians invaded the just rights of the Croats," etc. Jellachich, the man of the hideous name and yellow savage followers, must be presumed to be evil. Otherwise you will not understand the play. As the sky grows darker and the treacherous Emperor invites in the Russians, whose vast numbers (like the Spaniards in *Cyrano*) alone bring victory, the Hungarian, seeing all lost, replies by a *gab*. He twirls his moustache and declares the Emperor deposed. It is sheer declamation, a frankly theatrical defiance, but the none the less impressive for that. Even the end is staged. The hopeless struggle, which is as prolonged as Cyrano's death, ends not in defeat, but in the treachery of Görgei. We see the picturesque cavalry take leave of their horses with tears. The Honveds sullenly disband. The *preux chevalier*, Batthyanyi, whom no one could reproach with anything unmerciful or uncharitable in all his life, bids good-bye to his horse and attempts to kill himself; failing, he is murdered by the victors. The chief actor, Louis Kossuth himself, with a final gesture, slips through the victor's lines and rides for the Turkish border. One solitary fortress, alone amidst the conquerors, still holds out, so that men may say that the last place to fly the revolutionary flag in all Europe, was the fortress of Komorn, in Hungary.

Kossuth may have led a poor revolution, but he wrote a splendid story.

NOTE.—The following books are all that are available in the English language:

W. H. Stiles: *Austria in* 1848-49.
C. E. Maurice: *The Revolutionary Movements of* 1848.
"E. O. S.": *Hungary and its Revolutions* (Bohn).

In French see:

Iranyi and Chassin: *La Revolution de Hongrie* (2 vols.).

Documents

103 SUMMARY OF THE BILL ON THE MAGYAR TONGUE, APPROVED ON FEBRUARY 29, 1848

1. States the fact that his Majesty has been graciously pleased to inform the Diet that care had been taken to have the members of his family duly instructed in the Magyar language.

2. Decrees that the Magyar language shall be exclusively used as the official language of every department of the state, civil and ecclesiastical, with the exceptions mentioned in 5, 6, and 7. Official documents drawn up in any other language are invalid.

3. The Magyar language is also to be exclusively used in all the schools, colleges and universities of the Kingdom.

4. All coins and seals of office to bear Magyar devices and inscriptions in the Magyar language. The vessels of the Hungarian Littoral to bear the Hungarian flag alone.

5. The three Slavic counties are still to be allowed to make use of Latin, and the Littoral of either Latin or Italian for the space of six years, commencing with the close of the present diet, but only for local affairs.

6 and 7. The provisions of section 2 are so far extended to the *partes adnexae* (Croatia) that the authorities of the *partes* must correspond with the Hungarian authorities in Magyar, but are permitted to use Latin[1] in the administration of local affairs.

8. The provisions of section 3 do not extend to the *partes*, but Magyar is to be taught in all the public schools of the *partes*.

1848 March 13: Viennese Revolution. Fall of Metternich.
1848 March 17: King assents to a Hungarian Constitution.

104 SIX POINTS ON WHICH THE DIET SHOULD ENACT LAWS BEFORE DISSOLUTION, AS MOVED BY L. KOSSUTH ON MARCH 18[2]

1st. The limit of the powers and the form of government of the responsible Ministry of Hungary.[3]

2nd. The system of representation on which the next Diet, to meet at Pesth, should be constituted.[4]

3rd. One common taxation to be levied on all the inhabitants of the land.[5]

[1] Amendment carried: Latin, or any other language they themselves select.
[2] These summarise conveniently the reforms carried under his influence.
[3] Constitutional Monarchy, responsibility of ministers, etc. Republicanism was out of the question. The important section is given in full in *W. H. Stiles, op. cit. ii*, Appendix XXVII. The King cannot dissolve the Diet until it has voted the budget.
[4] Suffrage confined to Hungarians of 20 years of age who have (*a*) real property worth £30 or a "quarter session" (8 to 10 acres), or (*b*) possess a manufactory, workshop or shop, or are artisans of fixed employment with at least one assistant, or (*c*) have an income of £10 yearly, or (*d*) are members of the skilled professions (lawyers, doctors, etc.)
[5] Carried.

4th. The entire cessation of all Urbarial relations with an indemnification to the present proprietors of the land.[1]

5th. The immediate organisation of a National Guard to preserve the internal peace and the freedom of the country.[2]

6th. The abolition of the Censorship, by which to secure a free press and the institution of trial by jury.[3]

1848 May: Revolt of Rumanians, Serbs, and Croats.
1848 June 15: Suppression of revolt in Prague.[4]
1848 July 23: Additional Hungarian troops allowed for use against Italy.
1848 September: Advance of the Croats under Jellachich.
1848 October 3: Jellachich proclaimed Hungarian Dictator.
1848 October 6: On the arrival of troops to be used against Hungary, the Viennese revolt. Flight of the Emperor.
1848 October 30: Defeat of the attempt of Hungarians to aid Vienna.
1848 December 2: The Emperor abdicates in favour of his nephew, Francis Joseph.
1848-9 December-January: Austrian advance.
1849 January, February, March: Continual Austrian defeats.
1849 March: Austrians invite the Tsar's help.

105 THE HUNGARIAN DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

[*After declaring that the Austrian Emperor is only King of Hungary in virtue of a compact, which he has broken, and has moreover given other reasons for rebellion in dividing Hungarian territory.*]

21. The laws carried to strengthen the Constitution in the spring of 1848 gave the house of Austria the pretext for its perjury.

22. These laws have regenerated the country by radical reforms of the civil state. They abolished tithes[5] and forced labour, gave the right of representation to the people without distinction of race or religion (and it was the Diet based on the ancient aristocratic institutions which pronounced for these reforms): they established the principle of equality before the law, abolished freedom from taxation,[6] re-established the freedom of the Press

[1] The Urbarium of 1765 was a rigid and fixed form of feudal relationship enacted by Maria Theresa and but slightly modified since. The Diet (Act 9) abolished the *Roboth* or gift of one-ninth of the produce to the landlord, and " all urbarial relations whatsoever " from the day on which the act was published (April 11th). Also " The Legislature places the indemnification of the landed proprietors under the protecting shield of national honour." Tithes to the clergy are abolished without compensation, but the Legislature will provide for the support of the poorer clergy.

[2] To be a member of the National Guard it is necessary: (*a*) not to be a domestic servant; (*b*) to possess real property, value £20 in the town or a half session (16–20 acres) in the country; or to have a regular income of £10 yearly. (That is to say, working men are excluded.)

[3] Carried, but with a singularly reactionary measure demanding caution money of £1,000 from any journal.

[4] Henceforward the Slavs were entirely subservient to the Emperor and were contented with their Pan-Slav conference and a mock Parliament at Kremsier.

[5] A Secular as well as clerical exaction in Hungary.

[6] The privilege of most of the nobles.

which had been forcibly extinguished, instituted the jury system with other reforms. But although the reaction of the French Revolution had brought about revolutionary movements in almost all the provinces of Austria, and the dynasty had lost all its territory, the generous Hungarian nation was unwilling to make use of these difficulties to extract fresh concessions from the King; it was content to discover guarantees for its liberty and secular independence in a system of administration based on ministerial responsibility.

[*Follows a long account of the negotiations with the Emperor and their break-down, and the progress of the war.*]

90. In consequence, resting on all these facts and trusting in the justice of God and the judgment of the civilised world; relying on the natural rights of our nation and the strength it has shewn in its trials; in virtue of the duty of self-preservation inherent in all nations, we declare and decide the following in the name of the nation we legally represent.

1st. Hungary is proclaimed a free and independent European State with Transylvania, which is legally reunited to it, and with all the dependencies, counties and provinces of Hungary.

2nd. The house of Hapsburg-Lorraine having torn up with its own hands the Pragmatic Sanction[1] and broken all the links which existed through mutual contracts, between it and Hungary, and that by treachery, perjury and taking up arms against the Hungarian nation; the house of Hapsburg having dared to attempt the dismemberment of the country in separating from Hungary, Transylvania, Croatia, Slavonia, Fiume, and the Littoral[2] not even shrinking from the support of the armies of a foreign prince[3] to destroy the country's independent life; the said house of Hapsburg-Lorraine is, by the present declaration in the name of the nation, for ever excluded from the possession of Hungary, Transylvania, and all the dependent countries and provinces, banished from the land and deprived of civil rights.

Consequently, by the present declaration in the name of the nation, it is declared fallen, excluded from the throne and exiled.

3rd. The Hungarian nation, in returning to the European family as a free and independent state in virtue of its undeniable right, declares at the same time that it intends to keep and maintain peace and relations of neighbourly good-feeling with the peoples who were once subjects of the same prince as it, and to enter into alliance with all other nations in so far as its own rights are undamaged thereby.

4th. The National Assembly shall establish the form of the Government in all its details, but until these arrangements can be made, Louis Kossuth, unanimously chosen by the representatives of the nation as President of the Government, is proclaimed Governor-President, in charge of the Government of the whole breadth of the land, through such ministers as he may choose, on his responsibility and that of his ministers.

[1] 1723. This guaranteed to the Hungarians the preservation of "all documentary and other rights, liberties, privileges, immunities, customs, prerogatives and laws already conceded and established, or to be established by the present and future Diets."

[2] Observe that in nearly all these countries there was a non-Magyar majority.

[3] The Tsar of Russia.

* * * In requiring the Government of the Hungarian State to execute and publish our present decision, we invest it with the powers necessary to that end, and in the name of the nation we order all citizens to obey its commands and instructions.

Given by the Diet, in its sitting of the 19th April, 1849, at Debreczin.

The Magnates and Representatives legally convoked of the Hungarian Nation:

Signed:

Baron SIGISMUND PERENYI,
Second President of the House of Magnates.

PAUL ALMASSY,
Vice-President of the House of Representatives.

EMERIC SZACSVAY,
Secretary.

1849 May-August: Gradual decline of Hungarian fortunes.

106 THE ABDICATION OF THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

TO THE NATION.

AFTER the defeats which have lately befallen the nation, all hope is at an end of our being able any longer to continue with success the combat in self-defence against the allied powers of Russia and Austria.

Under such circumstances, the preservation of the national existence, and the guarantee for its future, are now solely to be expected from the leader at the head of the army; and as I am thoroughly convinced that the further continuance of the present government is not only useless, but even prejudicial to the nation, I accordingly inform the nation that, moved by that pure patriotic feeling which has led me to consecrate all my efforts, my whole life, exclusively to the Fatherland, in my own name as well as that of the ministry, I hereby resign and transfer the supreme civil and military power to General Arthur Görgei, until the nation in virtue of its right shall enact otherwise.

I expect from him—and I hold him responsible for it before God, the nation and posterity—that he will use his power, according to the best of his ability, for the salvation of the national existence of our Fatherland, for its welfare and for guaranteeing its future.

May he love his Fatherland as disinterestedly as I have loved it; and may he be more fortunate than I have been in securing the prosperity of the nation.

By actions I can no longer be useful to my Fatherland. Could my death avail for its well-being, joyfully would I sacrifice my life.

May the God of clemency and justice be with the nation.

Signed:

LOUIS KOSSUTH, Governor.

There also signed—

SABBAS VUKOVICH, Minister of Justice.

LADISLAUS CSANYI,
Minister of Communications and Public Works

MICHAEL HORVATH, Minister of Public Instruction.

AULICH, Minister of War.

Fortress of Arad, 11th August, 1849.[1]

1849 August 13: Görgei surrenders at Villagos.

1849 September 26: The Fortress of Komorn, the last Revolutionary stronghold in Europe, surrenders.

[1] In this last period, when no important economic or social changes were undertaken, but all energies were concentrated upon the national defence, the most important factor was the personal character of the Governor, who was waiting quietly while events forced the Hungarians into Republicanism. The above document is an illuminating and depressing commentary upon it. In Iranyi and Chassin (*op. cit.* I, 365) is given his plan (1851) for organising Hungary—a document jejune and unimaginative in the extreme.

Section III

Italy 1848-1849

107 "Manifesto to the European Peoples," Issued after the Expulsion of the Austrians from Milan, March 23 1848
108 Letter of Manin on Socialism, January 14 1849
109 Decree of the Roman Republic on Necessitous Citizens, April 4 1849
110 Roman Republic Decree on Peasant Proprietorship and on Division of Church Lands, April 1849
111 Last Proclamation of the Venetian Ministry of Marine, August 9 1849

Introduction

THE most dramatic outbreak of 1848 was undoubtedly in Italy. In this country the traces of Napoleonic rule had never been effaced. It had left a sentiment of national unity which had not been there before and a tradition of efficient and centralised Government tinged slightly with constitutionalism. In 1814 the dukes and princes, who had divided Italy up before, returned to their inheritance. Each and all depended for their existence on the Austrian Emperor, who ruled directly Lombardy with its capital, Milan, and all the territories, and the city of Venice. Every effort at even constitutional government was repressed with violence by Austrian soldiery. In 1821, for example, in conjunction with Russia, Metternich suppressed the Constitution which the people of Naples had forced on their King, although Naples was independent and the largest single state in Italy. The House of Savoy, which ruled over Piedmont, Genoa and Sardinia, had alone any pretensions to liberalism or efficiency. For it was not only the anti-national and despotic character of the minor Princes' Governments that enraged the growing and prosperous Italian middle-class, it was their mediæval habits and their gross and inexcusable corruption and incompetence. The working-class in Italy was simply Republican, it should be observed, and looked to Mazzini as its leader. Mazzini was opposed to Socialism, but was not therefore devoid of a programme of social reform, and for some time contested Marx's supremacy in the International.

In June, 1846, the old Pope died, and his successor, Pius IX, began to give certain mild concessions to the Liberals. On July 16, for example, he gave a partial and conditional amnesty to political prisoners and next year permitted the formation of a civic guard in Rome. By these small acts the frightened old man discovered he had given the signal for a widespread agitation. In January, 1848, even before the news of the French Revolution, there were riots in Milan and Sicily. In a very short while risings were successful in all parts of Italy and Constitutions granted everywhere. In February, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the King of Naples and the Pope of Rome himself all promised Constitutions. These, however, all really depended on Austria' goodwill, since Metternich's power was apparently untouched. But on March 18, on the news of the French Revolution, the capital city, Milan, rose, and after five days of bloody street fighting expelled Marshal Radetsky and the Austrian army. A Provisional Government was formed, and, by a common error, a respectable figurehead was sought. A rich and timid bourgeois, Casati, who was monarchist in principle and had striven desperately to compromise with Radetsky, was made chief of the Government, which instantly issued a Manifesto (No. 107), which sufficiently explains its character. It is interesting to observe the care with which the nationalist aspect of the Revolution is stressed, the absence of any programme or even statement of principles, and the typically bourgeois list of grievances. The craven timidity

of the Government, its inactivity and dependence on King Charles Albert of Piedmont—who had seized his opportunity and declared war on Austria on March 23—was in vivid contrast to the feverish activity of Mazzini and the Republican Party in general. From March till July, when internal affairs made it impossible for Austria to move, and the enthusiasm of the whole of Italy was at its highest, neither Casati nor Charles Albert made any proper attempt to prepare for the serious struggle which was yet to come. Instead, after initial and easy Piedmontese successes, the question was, with great unfairness, raised as to whether the new Lombard State should be united with Piedmont or not. In spite of Mazzini's indignant protest[1] the question was put to a plebiscite. With the enemy at the gate refusal of the King's demand was impossible, fusion was accepted on May 29, and a Council of Regency ousted the Provisional Government. On July 4, on the advice of its President, Manin, the Venetian Republic, for the same reason, accepted fusion.

Very soon, however, Charles Albert's vacillations brought their natural result, and on July 25 the Piedmontese army was led to complete defeat at Custozza. Milan was retaken by the Austrians on August 5, the King signed an armistice, and Venice once more became a Republic.[2]

During the winter, things were apparently quiet. Austria was too occupied with Hungary to be able to interfere in South Italy or even to crush Venice; hence Constitutional Government went on, until, in February, 1849, both the Pope and the Grand Duke of Tuscany fled from their respective states, and Republics were set up. That of Tuscany, under the virtual leadership of Domenico Guerrazzi, was short-lived and ignoble; but the Roman Republic was of far greater importance. It gave opportunity for the greatest man of the purely Republican movement, Mazzini, to outline his social programme, to rule his six-months Republic with amazing ability and gentleness, and to Garibaldi to signalise his cause with a brilliant and desperate military defence.

Mazzini's problem in the social administration of Rome was threefold: to employ the masses of poor in Rome, to make life possible for the ground-down peasantry, and to stop the continual absorption by the Church (which here was, of course, the State) of the major portion of the country's wealth. This he did (Nos. 109 and 110) by a programme of peasant proprietorship, confiscation of Church lands, and—for the moment—cheap housing in Rome. What else he would have done we do not know, for foreign intervention prevented him.

On March 12, encouraged by the revolt of Rome and Tuscany, and the continued resistance of Venice, Charles Albert again declared war on Austria and was again defeated, this time on March 23 at Novara. Austria was now free to turn her attentions to Venice. Then, on April 24, the President of the French Republic, Prince Louis Bonaparte, sent troops to Rome

[1] *Life and Writings* (V. 100).

[2] The repression by the Austrian Generals, Radetsky and Haynau, was excessively and inexcusably brutal. Their Croat soldiers were half-savages, and their wholesale massacres and even tortures were encouraged by General Haynau. When, in 1850, he took upon himself to visit London, and went to Barclay and Perkins' brewery, the draymen expressed the general hatred and contempt by driving His Excellency out with whips and sticks and flogging him to the waterside. The general delight over this exploit was shared even by Lord Palmerston.

without making clear his exact object. But it was soon seen, in spite of great duplicity, that these troops were really sent to restore the Pope, and a hopeless and bitter struggle began,[1] ending only with the surrender of Rome on July 3. An even more heroic, though less famous struggle, was made by the Venetian Republic. Its defence has been overshadowed by the greater fame of the Roman Republic; nevertheless, it deserves at least a moment's notice. Venice was governed, like Rome, practically by one man—in this case a Jew and a lawyer, Daniele Manin. I have not been able to find any details concerning his social policy, if he had any, but it seems that in this declining corner of Europe Socialism had not yet gained any real foothold. For this reason, and even more because of the urgency of the danger, we find in Venice that unity of classes which is essential for a heroic and theatrical defence. On the one hand a worker, Toffoli, was a member of the Government, and Manin imposed taxes and forced loans which fell very heavily upon the rich; on the other, Manin was careful to avoid a taint of Socialism (108).

In any case, rich and poor, priest and layman, had rallied to the support of the Republic. The Venetian State held the Austrian armies in check all through the long Italian summer, repeatedly declaring its considered intention to fight to the last. It is said of the Aztec opponents of Cortes that a score would willingly go to certain death to slay one Spanish invader. Such, too, was the spirit of the Venetians. Each inch of ground, each ruined fortress, was defended at no matter what cost so long as its resistance could harm the enemy. In the very last days their rotten and unseaworthy fleet put to sea (No. 111), not, indeed, that there was any hope of victory, or even of securing provisions, but merely that it might strike one blow, however feeble, before the defence collapsed.

Indeed, from the beginning the struggle was hopeless. Nothing but an unyielding determination rather to die than to live without the liberties they prized above all things, and at all costs to make the name of the Republic of St. Mark honoured among revolutionary names, could have upheld this desperate struggle. Only on August 28, 1849, seventeen days after the surrender of Görgei, did the city capitulate. Not a day's provision was in the city, the arsenals had run low, cholera and disease had destroyed their strength, yet, even so, Manin and the Assembly would not take upon themselves the stain of surrender but left it to the old Municipality to admit the Austrians.

Bibliographical Note

See:—

G. Mazzini:—*Life and Writings.*

Bolton King:—*Life of Mazzini* (Everyman).

G. M. Trevelyan:—*Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic* (particularly note the bibliography).

W. R. Thayer:—*The Dawn of Italian Independence.*

A. La Force:—*La République de Venise sous Manin.*

Bozzino:—*Il socialismo e la dottrina sociale di Mazzini.*

[1] See G. M. Trevelyan's *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic.*

Documents

1848 February 10: Neapolitan Constitution promulgated.
1848 February 17: Tuscan Constitution promulgated.
1848 March 10: Roman Constitution granted.
1848 March 18: Revolt of Milan. Provisional Government proclaimed.
1848 March 18-23: The Milanese "Five Days." Continual fighting results in the expulsion of the Austrian garrison.
1848 March 23: King Charles Albert of Piedmont declares war on Austria. Venetian revolt succeeds.

107 FROM THE "MANIFESTO TO THE EUROPEAN PEOPLES," ISSUED BY THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT AFTER THE EXPULSION OF THE AUSTRIANS FROM MILAN.

THE Austrian Government levied immoderate taxes on our property, on our persons, and on necessary articles, it extorted from us the means by which alone it was saved from bankruptcy, to the brink of which it was brought by its bad and dishonest financial system; it forced on us shoals of foreigners, avowed officials and secret spies; eating our substance, administering our affairs, judging our rights, without knowing either our language or our customs; it imposed on us foreign laws, incomprehensible from their multiplicity, and an intricate, endless system of proceeding in criminal cases, in which there was nothing either true or solemn except the prison and the pillory, the executioner and the gallows; it spread round us ensnaring nets of civil and ecclesiastical, military and judicial regulations, all converging to Vienna, which alone engrossed the monopoly of thought, of will and of judgment; it forbade the development of our commerce and our industry to favour the interests of other provinces and of government manufactures, the speculations of Viennese oligarchs; it submitted our municipal institutions, the boast of our country and the proof of national good sense, to a petty, harassing control, conceived for fiscal purposes and tending only to fetter us; it enslaved religion and even public benevolence, making it subject to administrative interference and turning it into an engine of government. It was after endless difficulties and only after having recourse to the lowest precautions that private individuals were permitted to help the public wants and preserve from contagion and corruption the poor abandoned to themselves in the streets, in their hovels, or in prison. It seized the property of minors, by forcing guardians to invest it in public securities, which were to be dealt with arbitrarily and mysteriously by secret agents of the government; it subjected the liberal arts to the most vexatious restraints; it persecuted native knowledge; it raised the most ridiculous objections and the most odious difficulties against printing or importing foreign printed books; it persecuted and entrapped our

most distinguished men and raised to honour slavish understandings; it systematized the scale of conscience and organized an army of spies, it encouraged secret informations, and made suspicion the rule of its proceedings; it gave the police full power over liberty, life and property, and threw the patriot into the same prison with the assassin.

1848 May 29: Lombardy votes for fusion with Piedmont.
1848 June 10: Council of Regency supersedes Provisional Government.
1848 July 4: Venice accepts fusion with Piedmont.
1848 July 25: Complete defeat of Piedmontese at Custozza.
1848 August 5: Fall of Milan. Armistice between Piedmont and Austria.
1848 August 11: Venice again becomes a Republic.

108 LETTER OF MANIN ON SOCIALISM.[1]

Venice, 14th Jan.

Dear Gavazzi,

I REGRET what has occurred. But you must remember that we have assumed the sacred task of defending Venice at all costs, and that Venice cannot be defended unless it is kept in tranquillity and concord. Now these necessary conditions might have been compromised by the *Circolo Popolare*. * * In consequence of the Socialist theories that had begun to be preached there. You know well that these seductive theories might quickly carry away the minds of ignorant but ardent and energetic workers and lead them to make terrible practical applications of them, which would imperil society and bring ruin upon those very poorer classes whose interests they professed to defend. France has lately given a very solemn and terrible example of this.[2]

Now, if these theories have produced such fearful consequences in Paris, which is threatened by no external foe, reflect how much more fatal they would be to Venice, besieged and blockaded, with an enemy at its very gates.

I beg of you also to remember that we have here, most assuredly, a good many Austrian emissaries, ready to light the torch of discord at the first spark that appears, because they perfectly well know that by these means alone can this city cease to be invincible. A great number of these agents wear the mask of ardent patriotism and become demagogues—they are really dangerous. * *

Your affectionate friend,

DANIELE MANIN.

[1] Too much importance should not be attached to this. It was written to Father Gavazzi to explain why Manin's Vigilance Committee had forbidden his lectures on Christian Socialism. But the whole affair was very academic and excited little interest.
[2] The June days.

1849 February 6: Grand Duke flies from Tuscany.
1849 February 9: Roman Republic proclaimed.
1849 March 12: Charles Albert again declares war.
1849 March 23: Battle of Novara. Charles Albert defeated and abdicates.

109 DECREE OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC ON NECESSITOUS CITIZENS, PASSED ON THE MOTION OF THE TRIUMVIRS[1] ON APRIL 4, 1849[2]

WHEREAS it is the office and duty of a well-organized Republic to provide for the gradual amelioration of the condition of the most necessitous classes;

Whereas the improvement most urgent at the present moment is that of withdrawing as many families as possible from the evils resulting from crowded and unhealthy habitations;

Whereas, while the Republic is occupied in endeavouring to allocate proper localities both in the provinces and Rome itself for the use of the indigent classes, it is a work of Republican morality to cancel even the vestiges of past iniquity by consecrating to benevolence that which past tyranny employed for torture, the Constituent Assembly, at the suggestion of the Triumvirs, decrees:—

(1) The edifice hitherto used as the *Holy Office*,[3] is henceforth dedicated to the use of necessitous families or individuals who shall be allowed to have lodgings therein on payment of a small monthly rent.

(2) A Commission is instituted composed of three representatives of the people and two civil engineers, to provide with all due speed for the execution of the present decree: * * *

(3) No sub-letting of the aforesaid lodgings will be permitted.

(4) The Commission will commence its sittings in the building itself on the 9th instant, for the immediate execution of the duties with which it is entrusted.

110 ROMAN REPUBLIC: DECREE ON PEASANT PROPRIETORSHIP AND DIVISION OF CHURCH LANDS

WHEREAS there is no more appropriate and speedy method of rendering the labours of the agriculturist lucrative, and of benefiting a most numerous and useful class; of strengthening their affection and interesting them in the organization of a great reform; of improving the soil and its cultivators at one and the same time by the emancipation of both, than that of parcelling out a large portion of the vast rural

[1] Mazzini, Saffi and Armellini.
[2] This and the following document give the internal policy of Mazzini in accordance with the words in his General Proclamation of April 5: "No war of classes; no hostility to existing wealth; no wanton or unjust violation of the rights of property; but a constant disposition to ameliorate the conditions of the classes least favoured by fortune."
[3] For the Inquisition.

possessions now actually administered, or about to be administered by the State, into small leasehold allotments at a moderate annual rent, redeemable at any given time, to one or several families of the poorest peasants; under such regulations and conditions as shall be deemed most fitting to ensure the speediest, most just and most stable execution of so salutary a purpose, it is decreed:—

1. A large portion of the rural domains belonging to religious corporations or other *main mortes* of whatever description in whatever portion of the Roman territory which either are already or are about to be placed under the administration of the State, shall be immediately divided into a given number of portions, sufficient for the maintenance of one or more necessitous families having no other means of subsistence; who shall hold them in free and permanent leasehold in consideration of a moderate *canon* payable to the State; redeemable at any given time from the leasehold.

2. A special regulation shall determine in detail the method by which this wholesome provision shall be carried into effect.

3. Analogous measures will be taken with regard to the *fondi urbani*, arising from the same or similar sources, with a view of providing better and less costly habitations for the poorer classes.

4. The measures already announced with regard to the fitting payment of the expenses of public worship, the pastoral administration of parishes, and other establishments of public interest, either through payment in kind, the produce of leaseholds, or other public monies belonging to the provincial or municipal authorities, will remain in force.[1]

5. The Ministers of Finance and of the Interior are charged with the execution of the present decree.[2]

1849 April 24: French land at Civita Vecchia.
1849 June 13: Ledru-Rollin's insurrection crushed in Paris.
1849 July 3: French enter Rome.
1849 July 15: Papal Government returns.

III LAST PROCLAMATION OF THE VENETIAN MINISTRY OF THE MARINE

Venice, 9th August, 1849.

THE fleet has left the port. The enemy has retreated before it in fear. To the words of the Commander the sailors replied with joyful voices that they were prepared for battle. I hope soon to be able to reward with spoken words of praise some who are unknown to me. May Venice be able to say: My ships have brought safety to me! My old

[1] By a decree of February 26 the Provisional Government had taken over the administration of Church property, making itself responsible for the payment of the clergy and other expenses.
[2] Another decree, important for a state such as Rome, in which the Church was the State, is that o April 27, which annuls the validity of perpetual religious vows.

arsenal has become the cradle of new glories for me! My hopes have not been vain! As the issue was long awaited, so I rejoice that this news will be a message of life to us in affliction. But let us trust in our holy immortal Right.

TOMMASEO

1849 August 28: Fall of Venice.

Section IV

Germany 1848-1849

112	Offenburg Conference's Programme, Winter	1847
113	Anonymous Republican Poster, March	1848
114	Hanau People's Commission, Instructions to the Elector, March 9	1848
115	Austrian Emperor's Proclamation, March 14	1848
116	"The Democrats to the Soldiers": pamphlet of March	1848
117	The King of Prussia: Proclamation "To My Beloved Berliners," March 18	1848
118	L. Feuerbach: Letter on Economic Conditions, April 3	1848
119	Minutes of the First Meeting of the Berlin *Arbeiter Club*, April 6	1848
120	Fr. Hecker on the First Baden Revolt, April	1848
121	G. Struve: *Republican Gazette*, No. 1, September 22	1848
122	Austrian Diet: Proceedings for October 7 and 8	1848
123	Resolutions of the Revolutionary Assembly, May 13	1849

Introduction

OF all the Revolutions of 1848 the German Revolution is, perhaps, the least interesting. Its impulse was largely alien in origin. It produced nothing new in revolutionary theory or tactics. Its leaders both of the Right and Left were utterly unequal to their task.

Germany in the year 1848 was in form a federation of Sovereign States. The Federal machine, however, existed for very little else than enforcing upon the minor States the extreme reactionary policy favoured by Prince Metternich of Austria. It forbade any concessions to Liberalism—relaxation of the censorship, granting of a democratic constitution, etc., and interfered in any State, such as Baden, which showed signs of weakening. It had no further function of importance, and did not act as a national executive or provide a means for the growth of national sentiment. Internally, though the reactionary policy of Metternich met with no opposition, there was a continual but silent struggle between Austria and Prussia for the effectual headship of Germany. In the minor South German States, it should be added, Liberalism had obtained a firmer footing than in the countries directly under Hapsburg or Hohenzollern rule.

Economically, Germany was behind France and England[1]. The feudal system was still strong; in the country districts, indeed, it was hardly impaired at all. Industry was as yet small and scattered. Frankfurt had, it is true, become a financial centre, but our conception of modern Germany as a great industrial State must not influence our view of Germany in 1848. Germany was then a weak and backward State, in which the shackles of feudalism had hardly been loosened and the beginnings of modern industry and commerce were still small and viewed with the greatest suspicion. Austria was thought to be as impenetrable and as reactionary as Russia or China. The bourgeoisie everywhere—the large and small employers and traders—was of recent growth, and, though growing rapidly, still of uncertain strength. The proletariat was weak, few in numbers and scattered. The large number of small Royalties and Highnesses meant that a disproportionate number of small employers were dependent on Court or aristocratic patronage. A serious attack on the monarchical principle was thus unlikely.

Politically, the German revolutionary forces were equally backward. Consisting as they did of petty bourgeois elements, in which the proletarian elements were latent only, they were naturally not attracted by Socialism. Karl Marx's *New Rhenish Gazette* was alone in showing any reasonable appreciation of Communism; for the rest, although the course of events in France, and the chatter of revolutionaries who wished to be on the extreme Left, created alarm among the bourgeoisie, Socialism was a negligible force. The Republicans, who formed the extreme Left, and were led by Gustav Struve and Fr. Hecker, were really occupied in putting the demands of the

[1] See Marx: *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, ch. i.

Moderates in a more violent form. Their programme, as adopted at Offenburg just before the Revolution (No. 112), differs very little from that of H. von Gagern or any other prominent Liberal. In fact, however, during the Revolution they made continual attempts to establish a unified German republic, which Moderates did not desire. Hecker and Struve made up for their weakness in ideas and in following by the violence and windiness of their rhetoric. The Moderates—Karl Mathy, H. von Gagern, etc.—aimed at the achievement of German democratic unity under a central power which would not supersede or destroy the existing States, or depose the monarchs, but would democratise them. Their ideal, that is to say, was a tight federation of democratic monarchies, in which the central and final authority was an all-German Assembly based on universal suffrage. In the attempt to carry out this perilous scheme they failed even more egregiously than the Republicans in their thoughtless and foolish revolts.

All parties were faced with a common enemy which did not play anything like so large a part in other countries. This was the army. The traditional Prussian militarism was as firmly rooted then as in 1914. Both sections of the Liberal movement were in continual fear of the Prussian and Austrian officer-castes. The Republicans in particular made fierce efforts to induce the rank and file to revolt, and to press their demand for the democratisation of the army (cf. Nos. 112 and 116).

Previous to the actual outbreak of the Revolution in March, 1848, there had been signs of growing discontent. The meeting at Offenburg, already mentioned, and the celebrated resolution of Bassermann in favour of German unity, in the Baden Assembly on February 12, are in themselves such indications. Moreover, the Prussian finances were in grave disorder and, the King having had to call the Committees of the Provincial Diets, these had ventured to demand a real Representative Assembly and had not voted a loan. Rothschild had refused (1846) to grant a loan without a guarantee by an Assembly.

However, the immediate impetus to revolution came from outside. The growing irritation of the bourgeoisie at feudal relics might have remained a grumbling protest for years to come. It was the French Revolution which made the German Revolution; and all through its course the latter was ridiculously dependent upon the vagaries of Paris revolutionary fortunes. Carl Schurz[1] relates how he was busily writing a tragedy when a friend burst into his room and informed him that Louis Philippe had been expelled. He laid down his pen, abandoned his tragedy and went out with his fellow-students to make a revolution. This naive dependence upon France, exemplified also in the document here numbered 113, was as noticeable in defeat as in victory. The man who struck the heaviest blow at the German Revolution was neither Windischgrätz nor Frederick William IV, but Louis Napoleon Bonaparte

The effects of the Revolution were, of course, felt first in South Germany. The news reached Mannheim on February 27. It was feared that

[1] *Reminiscences*, vol. i, p. 111.

Hecker and his friends would storm the Baden Chamber; a revolutionary outbreak was certainly only averted by the Liberal, Karl Mathy, who took the chair for a meeting called by the Radicals, carried its demands immediately to the Grand Duke, induced him to grant them at once, and thus ably out-manœuvred Hecker. But not by such means could the German Revolution be forestalled. Before the fortnight was out every minor potentate in Germany was on his knees—workers, students and bourgeoisie were unanimous. The Highnesses were practically without defenders. Both the tone and matter of the resolution of the Hanau People's Commission (114) are typical. The revolutionaries had only to ask for anything to be given. Their victory, however, would have remained a passing uproar, if Prussia and Austria had not been attacked. But on March 13 the people of Vienna rose and drove out Metternich, and the Austrian Emperor conceded the usual "March fruits," including the arming of a National Guard.[1] The shock was terrific: Austria had been closed to the world of thought, like China; Metternich had been the heart and soul of reaction, all classes were united in expelling him. The Revolution, like the Revolution of 1917, had struck directly at the centre of European reaction. The King of Prussia saw in this only an occasion to profit Prussia at the expense of Austria. But on March 18 the barricades were up in his own city of Berlin. Here the revolutionary victory was more difficult. It looked, on the night of the 18th, as though they must be defeated, and the distracted and feeble King issued the extraordinary proclamation—"To my beloved Berliners" (No. 117), which shows that he believed he could keep the situation in hand. But whether from accident or no, the troops left Berlin next day and the Revolution was victorious. The indignant revolutionaries bore the mutilated corpses of their dead to the Castle Square; the King was forced to come out and stand bareheaded before his victims while the people sang *Jesus meine Zuversicht*.[2] This was the limit of the Prussian people's vengeance. But it sufficed to reduce the King to the most servile abasement. For the moment, he obeyed every wish. At this time we can perceive the beginnings of a German Labour movement in the Arbeiter Club, founded by Stephan Born (119), a Marxist compositor. It was to have been a large federation, but it shared in the general revolutionary decline. Born went to Dresden, where he conducted the defence in 1849. The Prince of Prussia, object of the chief hatred of the people, fled to England.

[1] See No. 115 and note its pathetic tone of appeal.

[2] Freiligrath wrote later (*The Living to the Dead*):

> " Die Kugel mitten in der Brust, die Sterne breitgespalten,
> So habt ihr uns auf blut'gem Belt hoch in die Lust gehalten!
> Hoch in die Lust mit wildem Schrei, dass uns're Schmerzgebärde
> Dem, der zu töten uns befahl, ein Fluch auf ewig werde! . . ."

But in July:—

> " O ernste Schau! Da lägen wir, im Haupthaar Erd' und Gräser,
> Das Antlitz fleckig, halbverwest—die rechten Reichsverweser!
> Da lägen wir and sagten aus: Eh' wir verfaulen konnten
> Ist eure Freiheit schon verfault, ihr trefflichen Archonten!
> Schon fiel das Korn, das keimend stand, als wir im Märze starben:
> Der Freiheit Märzsaat ward gemäht noch vor den andern Garben.
> Ein Mohn im Felde hier und dort entging der Sense Hieben—
> O, wär' der Grimm, der rote Grimm, im Lande so geblieben!"

See J. G. Legge: *Rhyme and Revolution in Germany*, p. 317.

On the 20th the King of Bavaria abdicated. This was the last victory of the Revolution. Every German State had in name been democratised and provided with the most liberal Constitution compatible with monarchy. Liberty of the Press, person, speech, association, etc., had been freely conceded. On March 31 a Fore-Parliament (Vorparlament) from the Estates had met and was arranging for the convocation of a German National Assembly, based upon universal suffrage and presumably sovereign, whose meeting the various Governments, so far from preventing, had to arrange for and hasten. Everywhere the peasants had been freed from feudalism. In Austria this gain was permanent.

Here, however, ends the victorious course of the Revolution. The people had not succeeded in gaining any control over the administration. Certain of the most obnoxious Ministers, in all countries, had been expelled, and their places taken by less-hated officials. Rarely was the popular party in control, and, where it appeared to be in control—as, one would have said, under Ludolf Camphausen in Prussia—closer inspection shows that the Ministry belonged to the upper bourgeoisie, which was preparing to pass over to the reactionary side.

The reasons for this are various, but the most potent is shown in Feuerbach's letter (118). The Revolution had coincided with, and not been preceded by, a financial crisis and condition of general distress. Prices soared and loans and interest became irrecoverable. This unforeseen collapse was unanimously put down by the big and small traders and financiers and the whole middle-class to the disorders accompanying the Revolution. By the beginning of April the middle-class was firmly convinced that the Revolution was completed, Constitutions and a National Assembly having been granted; that any further steps, if necessary, must be left to the Assembly, and that the sole immediate object was a vigorous restoration of order, so that commerce, and so finance, might revive. The disintegration of the revolutionary forces had begun. The bourgeoisie was henceforward concerned only in maintaining order; the safeguarding of the Revolution was in the hands of the students, gallant and generally disciplined, but few in numbers, and the workers, themselves none too numerous and utterly undisciplined, wavering, and unreliable.

In Prussia, particularly, the Liberal Government restored order, and stamped out the Polish movement, by means of the old officials. The Liberals acted, in fact, as repairers to the Royalties, restarting the machines of official repression which had been smashed by the Revolution. It is characteristic of the unpractical character of German Liberals, that while the Liberal, Camphausen, was destroying the Polish movement in Posen by violence and murder, his party was at the same time advocating a war on Russia to free the oppressed Poles! A further exploit of this Ministry was "temporarily" to restore feudal relations in the country. In Vienna, much the same story. At first unanimity was absolute. Then the numbers of unemployed increased greatly, and had to be met from the rates. The commercial crisis reached

Vienna. On May 18 a fresh uproar, which led to the definite granting of a Constitution, also led to the departure of the Emperor. With the disappearance of the Court, the luxury trades, Vienna's staple industry, came to a standstill. The division between the workers and bourgeoisie became acute. Here, as elsewhere, the Academic Legion, the students' armed force and the strongest power in Vienna, was on the workers' side. Indeed, such was the relative power of the two, that it would not have seemed foolish to say, rather, that the workers were on the students' side.

The first blow, which made the split between workers and bourgeois irreparable, was due to Hecker's imbecility. He and his friends, having been excluded from a Committee of Fifty elected by the Vorparlament to fill the interim between its own dispersal (April 4) and the meeting of the Assembly, proclaimed the Republic at Constance and marched into Baden at the head of a few followers. His army was routed on the 20th, and the only effect of his stupid escapade, so grandiloquently described in Document 120, was to impress upon the bourgeoisie that the Republicans would not under any circumstances permit peace or allow commerce to be resumed.

Thus, the National Assembly, which met at Frankfurt a. M. on May 18, met under dismal auspices. Everywhere the governments and peoples were in a condition of suspended hostility—the people, waiting for their representatives to give them a lead, the governments waiting until the official machine should have been restored to its full efficiency, and the popular élan have disappeared, to withdraw all the March concessions. Under these circumstances the duty of the Parliament was to protect the March gains at the least. It was faced with a most difficult problem in diplomacy—the carrying out of the programme outlined above (p. 243)—which must be solved without permitting the kings to reattain their old position. It will scarcely be believed that the Assembly did nothing whatever, but plunged at once into an interminable discussion of the bases of a Constitution and of the rights of the citizen. Only twice did it intervene in current politics, and then it played into the hands of reaction. Mild Liberalism was, of course, the prevailing sentiment in the Assembly.

Only one act of importance was taken in the year 1848 by this egregious body. This was in itself an abstract declaration of principle—the *Grundrechte* or fundamental rights. This is a document of importance in itself and later, being incorporated in the constitution, became the subject of the last revolt. It runs thus (Dr. Ward's summary):—

> Every German is a citizen of the Empire. No German State shall, in the administration of civil or penal law, make any difference between its own subjects and those of any other State. Before the law there exists no distinction of classes. The rights of all citizens are equal; the duties of all are the same; every man is bound to serve the Empire in arms. Personal freedom is inviolable; and no man may be arrested except on a judicial warrant which gives the cause of his detention and is communicated to him within twenty-four hours after his arrest. All

> Germans have the right of freely expressing their opinions by word of mouth, in writing or in print: the right of free petition; the right of public meeting. Every German State is to possess a Constitution with a popular representation, and to this representative body the Ministers are to be responsible.[1]

The Frankfurt Assembly, on June 30, selected the Austrian Archduke John as Regent of Germany (Reichsverweser). In other words, it placed whatever power it had in the hands of a member of the royal caste set upon its downfall. After this act of statesmanship it relapsed into the discussion of first principles; and may be said to have voted itself off the stage.

The struggle was thus between the governments and their own local revolutionaries. The complete defeat of the French Revolution on June 26 had a very large share in ensuring the victory of the former. And the division between bourgeois and worker was emphasised by a bloody battle in the streets of Vienna between the unemployed and the bourgeois National Guard on August 23. At the moment, however, the governments did not feel strong enough to attack the "March-fruits" directly, and left the local assemblies—all chattering imitations of Frankfurt—to continue their aimless debates. The outbreak of a fresh struggle, however, came over an apparently small matter—the punctation of Malmö with Denmark.

The cause of the war with Denmark was an attempt by the Danish King to destroy the separate institutions of Schleswig and Holstein, which were predominantly German, and to incorporate Schleswig in the Danish Kingdom. Prussia had supported the cause of the Schleswig-Holsteiners, and when the Danes turned to coercion, had sent troops to aid the rebels. The Vorparlament had also raised troops which co-operated and were by no means unsuccessful. The Assembly gladly continued an enterprise upon which German national sentiment was so set. The existence of a Federal army, and the concentration of national feeling upon itself as the defender of German unity, was felt even by the Right to be desirable. It fixed conditions under which alone the war might cease. On August 26 the Prussian Government, disliking the revolutionary sentiment, excited by this irregular war on behalf of the rebels, made a "punctation" at Malmö with the Danes, an arrangement which ceded everything which the Danes desired and practically handed over the Holsteiners to their fate. The instructions of the Frankfurt Assembly had been utterly ignored, and when the news was conveyed to it on September 5, there was an outburst of fury. In refusing to acknowledge the punctation the Assembly would have been supported by the indignation of all German national patriots. Instead, on September 14, the Right was with some difficulty brought to heel, the Assembly ate its words, meekly accepted the punctation and abandoned the Schleswig-Holsteiners. The rage of the revolutionaries was now turned against the Assembly, and the Revolution once again entered on an acute phase. An indignant meeting on the 17th in Frankfurt led to an attempt to purge the Assembly next day: the Pauls-

[1] *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. xi, p. 167.

kirche, its place of meeting, was besieged, and a fierce battle ensued. The Assembly was rescued by Prussian troops. Frankfurt was hardly pacified when Struve, judging the moment opportune, entered Baden at the southern end and proclaimed the Republic. His rising, though less insensate than Hecker's, was far too feeble to hope for success. The Republic existed hardly longer than was necessary to issue its programme (No. 121), and was ended by a defeat on September 24.

The growing strength of the reactionary party led to a move on the part of the Austrian Emperor which was undoubtedly a mistake. The Hungarian revolution had, up till now, observed strictly legal forms. It was fighting Jellachich, the Ban of Croatia, who was in fact at the head of the Pan-Slavs, and whom the Emperor had disavowed. He now thought that the time had come to smash the Magyar Revolution through the Slav movement. On October 5 he declared the Hungarian Diet dissolved, and nominated Jellachich military dictator of Hungary. Troops were to be sent from Vienna to his support. On October 6 the people of Vienna rose to prevent their leaving: the Minister of War was murdered: the Emperor and most of the Ministry fled: the revolutionaries were left in power. The Austrian Diet (see No. 122) took control.

The Court, now at Olmütz, vigorously organised a Slav force—Czech and Croat—under Prince A. Windischgrätz, to recapture Vienna. By October 23 these obedient races had furnished a large enough army for Windischgrätz to attack Vienna. Meanwhile the revolutionary city was in confusion. There was no one among the revolutionaries of ordinary administrative ability. The Diet was capable only of creating disorder and was, in any case, pre-occupied with its own safety in case of defeat. Messenhauser, the commander, was incompetent and his subordinates ignored him. The Hungarian forces, which had defeated Jellachich, advanced to the Austrian frontier, crossed it, recrossed, crossed and recrossed again and stated that they had not received a formal invitation from the Austrian Diet. At last, on the 30th, when the defence of Vienna had practically collapsed, they attacked Windischgrätz at Schwechat, and were defeated. Windischgrätz and Jellachich entered Vienna on October 31 and November 1. The usual slaughter followed, but what excited most fury was the killing of Robert Blum, one of the few really able members of the Left, a member of the Frankfurt Assembly who was not even an Austrian subject. With the fall of Vienna ended the Austrian Revolution. The victories of the Hungarian Revolution, however, prevented the emperor from taking any effective action in Germany proper.

Almost at once the Prussian Revolution met a similar fate. Here the machinery of reaction had been so ably prepared that there was no resistance On November 9 a ministry which had previously deferred to the Assembly dissolved it: the Assembly refused to accept dissolution: General Wrangel's troops dissolved it without a struggle. It left nothing behind but a futile appeal for passive resistance.

The gains of the revolution remained only in the Rhineland, where the Frankfurt Assembly was still discussing. Its defeat was delayed until the next spring. In March of 1849, the Austrian Emperor removed all the traces of the terrible year just passed. He closed down the Diet, rejected its Constitution, imposed one of his own devising, and sent the Pan-Slavs about their business. He also declared that Austria was no part of Germany (March 4). The question which had been puzzling the heads of the Frankfurt deputies —whether Austria or Prussia should lead the new Germany—was thus rudely settled for them. Accepting the inevitable, the Assembly agreed to offer the King of Prussia the new crown, which it did on March 25. It was then informed, in effect, that the crown was not its to offer.

What would have been the result of this rebuff is uncertain. The Assembly proceeded to take the one vigorous action of its life. On April 11 it declared its constitution, including the *Grundrechte*, to be the law of the land and enforceable as such. This was a direct challenge to the existing authorities. The Prussian, Hanoverian and Saxon Chambers accepted the declaration and were instantly dissolved for their insolence. The Right began to leave the Frankfurt Assembly in streams and the control thus fell to the Left. Almost immediately the Rhineland and Saxony rose in revolt against the Governments and in favour of the Frankfurt Constitutions. In Rhenish Prussia the revolts were no more than skirmishes. In Dresden the King of Saxony was driven out and the town held by the revolutionaries, among whom were Richard Wagner and Michael Bakunin. In Baden and the Bavarian Palatinate the whole state, army and all, went over to the Revolution on May 11 (No. 123).

So far, however, from the Assembly aiding and recognising those who were rising in its defence, it took no action, and when events forced it to leave Frankfurt, it fled not to Baden, but to Würtemburg, whence it was ignominiously expelled; it then retired to Switzerland. Dresden was captured by the Prussians on May 9. The Baden Revolution had a longer life: in spite of the deficiency of its leaders, of whom the chief, Lorenz Brentano, was an incompetent adventurer, the rank and file offered a heroic resistance. Five times their own number, according to Marx's estimate, were required to defeat the revolutionaries. But defeated they were in the end, and with the fall of the last fortress of Rastatt on July 23, 1849, the first German Revolution was at an end.

Bibliographical Note

In English the best connected history is A. W. Ward's *Germany*, vol. i (Cambridge Historical Series).

J. G. Legge's *Rhyme and Revolution in Germany* is an attempt to tell the story of the Revolution and preceding years by extracts from contemporary writers, proclamations, papers, and so on, which is of the greatest value. Books iv to vii are essential to supplement the rather meagre selection of documents given here.

Karl Marx: *Revolution and Counter-Revolution.* This is not a history, but a series of comments from the Socialist point of view. It is also indispensable especially because of its economic analysis.

Of German books, Hans Blum: *Die Deutsche Revolution*, and Laube: *Das erste Deutsche Parlament* may be mentioned. The *Cambridge Modern History* should be consulted for the bibliography (vol. xi).

Documents

112 PROGRAMME OF THE OFFENBURG CONFERENCE

(Resolutions carried at a Conference of Hecker and Struve's Followers at Offenburg in the Winter of 1847.)

The Demands of the German People.

UNIVERSAL arming of the populace, with free election of officers.

A German Parliament freely elected by the people. Every German, as soon as he is 21 years of age, is entitled to a primary vote and eligible as a delegate. A delegate is to be elected for every 1000 of the population, and for every 100,000 a representative in Parliament. Every German, without distinction of rank, position, wealth or religion, may be chosen as a representative in this Parliament, as soon as he has passed his 25th year. The Parliament is to hold its sittings in Frankfort, and is to determine its own methods of procedure.

Complete freedom of the Press.

Complete freedom in respect of religion, of conscience, and of teaching.

Administration of justice on lines consistent with the national character and trial by jury.

Universal German citizenship.

Just taxation according to income.

Comfort, education and instruction for all.

Protection of labour and the right to work.

Adjustment of the relations between capital and labour.

Popular and economical administration.

Responsibility of all ministers and officials.

Abolition of all privileges.

1848 February 12: Bassermann's resolution in the Baden Chamber.
1848 February 25: Success of the French Revolution.
1848 February 27: von Gagern's motion for a National Parliament in the Darmstadt Chamber.

113 ANONYMOUS REPUBLICAN POSTER OF THE FIRST DAYS OF MARCH

France is a republic.
The hour has struck for us, too!

Germans,

OUR brothers in France have bravely led the way. They have shaken off their yoke and have raised a splendid altar to the Liberty they have so long desired.

This same France, which has twice overthrown her tyrants, has twice terrified the princes of Europe and awakened the peoples from their slumber to a new life, this same France has now risen a third time.

[*The men of* 1789 *have risen from their graves. This time we must fight with and for them, not against them.*]

All the peoples have one burden, one grief, one pain—they have one hope, one aim, one salvation. When all *words*, all entreaties, all speeches have been in vain, when our princes and their parasites have broken every promise, every oath they made in our wars for liberty, when our arrogant masters deride their patient subjects, then, *men*, our only salvation is in resolute, courageous and manly *deeds*.

* * * * * * * * *

Everywhere beneath the banner of Liberty we will march united in close brotherhood and cast in the face of our oppressors this last threatening challenge.

Give us what we want, Freedom, or we shall take it.

The people is supreme if it chooses to be, and if it will be united. It will defeat the faithlessness of diplomats and the arrogance of courtiers, it will win in spite of the hypocrisy of priests and of all the opposition of the selfish plutocrats.

Switzerland has lately freed herself from the gloomy domination of the Jesuits.[1] * * *

Italy is successfully opposing the oppression of Austria in the north, just as she overthrew the tyrants that Austria had set up in the south.

France broke her chains in a few days, in spite of 100,000 men and 400 cannons. * * *

[*Let us add to these triumphs, a free Germany. Now is the moment to act. Let us give the signal for revolt to the Poles and to the Silesians.*]

Bread and *Liberty*, which the princes have stolen from us and from our brothers, we will win back in battle.

Let us march together and show ourselves true men. The soldiers, the servants of Power, will prove to be our brothers. As in Paris, they will turn their weapons on their masters and give their hands to the People.

We see the banner of freedom floating over Paris, and we *demand* the *people's rights*. If we are met with a refusal we shall grasp our weapons and fight for what we seek.

1848 March 1: Baden Revolution. Hecker forestalled by Karl Mathy.

114 THE HANAU PEOPLE'S COMMISSION. INSTRUCTIONS TO THE ELECTOR. (DEMANDS CONCEDED ON MARCH 11)

The People's Commission, in Hanau, to His Royal Highness the Elector of Hesse.

BY your Royal Highness's proclamation of 7th instant the wishes of the people are not fulfilled and their requests are incompletely granted. The people mistrusts your Royal Highness personally, and sees in the failure to grant its requests a lack of straightforwardness. The people sees in

[1] The war of the Sonderbund.

this failure to grant its requests a proof of the necessity to band themselves still more closely together and to assume an attitude of stronger opposition to your Royal Highness.

The people of which we speak is no longer the mere idea of former times: no, it means Everybody, Everybody! Yes, your Royal Highness, Everybody! Even the army has declared itself unanimous!

The people demands its rights. It states its will that its future shall be better than its past, and this will is irresistible. The people has chosen a Commission, which now demands for it, and in its name:—

1. The filling of all ministries, so far as this has not recently been done, by men who enjoy the confidence of the people.

2. The dissolution of the Diet, which has been called together again, and its immediate re-summoning as an electoral body.

3. Granting of complete freedom of the Press on the lines laid down in section 95 of the administrative decree.

4. Complete amnesty for all political crimes committed since 1830.

5. Complete freedom of religious thought and practice and of conscience.

6. The exercise of influence on the German Confederation to establish a German popular House. The revocation of all ordinances restricting the enjoyment of constitutional rights, especially those affecting the right of petition, of union and of meeting.

7. A definite assurance that the legislative proposals promised in the proclamation of the 7th instant, and now made even more imperative by the expression of these demands, shall be laid before the next assembly of representatives.

8. A decision on these points from your Royal Highness within 3 days, after which lapse of time, without a reply, you will be assumed to have given a refusal.

Now is the time for your Royal Highness to show your intentions to the people. Do not delay an instant in granting these demands in full! Cool-headed men assure your Royal Highness that this agitation has assumed a terrible aspect.

Armed help from the neighbouring cities is already at hand: already we are familiar with the thought of a possible breach, and we know the power of the accomplished fact.

Your Royal Highness, yield! May God guide your heart!

Hanau, 9 March, 1848.

The People's Commission.

Pellissier, Zisgler, Pflüger, Eberhard, Braun, Rauh, Weidmann, Schreer, Heydt, jun., Rommel, Braubach, *Adv.*, Rollenberger, Springmühl, Rottelberg, Renaud, Pressel, *Dr.*, Manns, *Adv.*, Chr. Lautenschläger, Schärttner, P. Jung, Graf W. Wagner, August Gouze, Aug. Rühl.

1848 March 5: Heidelberg meeting to arrange for the Vorparlament.
1848 March 13: Revolution in Vienna. Metternich expelled.

115 PROCLAMATION BY THE AUSTRIAN EMPEROR

I have decreed the establishment of a National Guard. * * * I have nominated Count von Hoyos commander in chief of this National Guard, whose organization shall be at once provided for. I trust in the faithfulness and devotion of my subjects for a proper response to this sign of confidence in them.

FERDINAND.

Vienna, 14th March, 1848.

1848 March 14: Viennese Censorship abolished.
1848 March 14: The Austrian Diets summoned "for July 3rd at the latest."

116 "THE DEMOCRATS TO THEIR BROTHERS THE SOLDIERS." (PAMPHLET OF THE MARCH DAYS)

The Democrats to their Brothers the Soldiers.

Soldiers—

THERE was a time when the army and the people were one. That was the time when our fathers fought for freedom and for the independence of our Fatherland on the battle fields of Belle-Alliance [*Waterloo*] and before Paris. Then there was no such disunion as now separates us from each other.

[*Our fathers fought for freedom, but it was denied them. Now again we have fought and achieved liberty.*] We have fought, we say it with bleeding hearts, against some of you, against some of our brothers. But yet we were fighting for these very brothers, the enemy! For we wanted freedom, not for ourselves alone, but equally for us and for you, for the people and for the army.

Soldiers, many of your officers have told you that we were your foes, that we were opposed to law and order, which you were called upon to uphold. Soldiers, you were shamefully deceived. We want law and order * * * but we want freedom, too. * * * *But those who stir you up to hatred against us fear that liberty for us would mean the end of their privileges and their power over you. That is why they use you for oppression.*

[*We are not unmindful of the special needs of soldiers.*]

We demand that you shall not be kept for years from your native hearths, but that, when your training is over, you shall be restored to your fathers, your mothers and your brothers and sisters. * * * *

We demand that you should be allowed to elect your own N.C.O.s and officers up to the rank of captain from a list provided by the War Ministry of capable men worthy of such positions. * * *

We demand that every private, if he can pass the necessary examination, should be eligible to become a N.C.O., and every N.C.O. to become an officer. * * *

[*All privileges must be abolished; merit alone must decide promotion.*]

We demand that the Fatherland should make the provision that they deserve for the military invalids.

[*We want the pay of the higher ranks reduced and that of the lower ranks raised.*]

We demand that the reservists shall be called out only when the Fatherland is attacked by foreign enemies. * * * *

[*We demand that in peace time you should be subject to civil and not military law.*] *For you are free citizens as we are. The conditions of injustice and slavish subjection in which you now live must cease.* * * *

SOLDIERS, BROTHERS, COMRADES.

YOUR UNHAPPY HATRED OF US MUST CEASE. GIVE NO EAR TO THOSE WHO STIR UP THIS HATRED. DO NOT MISJUDGE US: ARE YOU TOO NOT THE SONS OF CITIZENS? WILL YOU NOT RETURN SOONER OR LATER TO YOUR CIVILIAN OCCUPATIONS?

HAVE WE NOT ALL, AS COMRADES IN THE MILITIA, STOOD WITH THE SAME WEAPONS AND IN THE SAME REGIMENTS AS YOU ARE NOW?

WILL YOU KILL YOUR OWN FLESH AND BLOOD? WILL YOU KILL YOUR BROTHERS, AS CAIN KILLED ABEL? SOLDIERS, BROTHERS! WE WILL NOT BELIEVE IT!

THEY ARE TRAITORS WHO WOULD MAINTAIN SUCH VIEWS. WE EXTEND TO YOU THE HAND OF BROTHERHOOD. YOU WILL NEVER REFUSE IT.

1848 March 18: Beginning of the Berlin Revolution. Barricade fighting.

117 KING OF PRUSSIA: PROCLAMATION "TO MY BELOVED BERLINERS" ON THE NIGHT OF MARCH 18–19.

To my beloved Berliners!—

BY my proclamation yesterday summoning the Diet you have received an assurance of your king's sincere good-will towards you and to the whole German Fatherland. But the rejoicings with which unnumbered hearts had greeted me had not yet died away when a crowd of malcontents introduced seditious and extremist demands, and increased in their numbers as the well-disposed people went away. Since their riotous advance right up to the gates of my castle naturally gave rise to suspicions of

their evil designs, and since insults had been hurled at my brave and faithful soldiers, the square had to be cleared by cavalry, who came in at a walking pace with their weapons sheathed, and two infantry muskets went off accidently, thank God, without hitting anyone. A number of miscreants, chiefly strangers to Berlin, who, though they have been sought for, have known where to hide, have, with obvious falsehoods, traded upon this circumstance in the furtherance of their evil designs, and filled the excited minds of a number of my true and faithful Berliners with thoughts of revenge for the blood that it was presumed had been spilt, and so assumed the gruesome responsibility for the bloodshed. It was only then that my troops, your brothers and countrymen, made use of their weapons, as they were forced to do by the many shots fired at them from the Königstrasse. The victorious advance of the troops was the inevitable sequel.

It is for you, the inhabitants of my beloved native city, to prevent greater evil. Realise, your King and truest friend affirms, by all that is most sacred to you, that the affair was an unfortunate accident. Return to peace! Clear away the barricades that are still standing, and send to me men of the genuine old time Berlin spirit with words fit to address to your King, and I give you my royal word that all the streets and squares shall at once be cleared of troops, and that the military occupation shall be confined to the necessary buildings —the castle, the arsenal, and a few others, and even there only for a short while. Hear the fatherly voice of your King, inhabitants of my true and lovely Berlin, and forget what has passed, as I will forget it, for the sake of the great future which, by God's blessing of peace, will dawn for Prussia, and, through Prussia, for Germany.

Your loving Queen and truly sincere mother and friend, who is prostrate with grief, joins with mine her sincerest, tearful entreaties.

Written in the night of 18-19 March, 1848.

FREDERICK WILLIAM.

1848 March 19: Troops leave Berlin. Triumph of the Revolution.
1848 March 20: Prussian political amnesty. Prince of Prussia flies.
1848 March 20: King of Bavaria abdicates. New Ministry formed.
1848 March 21: Incorporation of Schleswig.
1848 March 25: King of Prussia leaves Berlin.
1848 March 31: Vorparlament meets at Frankfurt a. M.

118 LUDWIG FEUERBACH: LETTER (TO BERTHA FEUERBACH) ON ECONOMIC CONDITIONS.[1]

Leipzig, 3 April, 1848.

* * * This is a time when everything is at stake. Even on the best security there is no ready money to be had. On every side is bankruptcy, or at least temporary suspension of payment, because everyone wants to look

[1] *Ludwig Feuerbach in seinem Briefwechsel und Nachlass:* Grün, 1874, p. 369. Quoted in part in Legge, (*op. cit.*) p. 245.

after himself and bury his talent, *i.e.*, his money. Wigard has about 200,000 thalers to collect from a thousand business houses. He will consider himself lucky if as much as a half is paid by Easter. The root of the trouble is not a real shortage of money, but the fear that war or popular revolts will ruin the possessing classes: this affects all classes, stops all business, and undermines all credit. * * * We are living in a time of crisis and of revolution. It cannot be helped. One must be content with the barest necessities and be thankful to get even a crust of bread. * * * My winter coat seems heavy in this heat, but I hesitate to get myself a new one. * * *

119 MINUTES OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE BERLIN *ARBEITER CLUB*, APRIL 6, 1848.

ON 6th April, 1848, the meeting called by the *Arbeiter-Club* took place at No. 62 Sebastian Street.[1] The notice convening the meeting seems to have been misunderstood for the hall was filled largely with non-delegates:

The President,[2] a compositor named Born, opened the proceedings with a forceful speech. The workers must now realise what their rights were, and not allow themselves to be cheated out of the fruits of the Revolution. These would never be achieved, however, merely by rioting; they must work on a single and united plan. He regretted to say that a few reports had reached him that workers were going in for the smashing of machinery; such a report was calculated to bring their movement into discredit. He knew that it was a crafty invention of the reactionaries, a last kick of the bourgeoisie; nevertheless he earnestly advised the workers to let all personal hatred die. They would have to wait until complete unity among the workers was secured; to this end a circular had already been dispatched calling for the election of delegates from every trade. To-day their numbers were not yet complete, and he would therefore declare the meeting open for the discussion of general topics.

Michaelis (tailor):—You all know that on March 26th, a Commission took powers to relieve distress. Immediately many petitions poured in. Now it has become quite clear that this Commission had neither the right to its title nor competence for its duties, for we have never heard what was the result of our petitions. We are agreed on this, that every establishment and every factory should unite to elect after due consideration men to form a Central Commission. Popular meetings are useless: everybody cries "Order! Order!" and immediately disorder is produced, immediately we bring out our bourgeoisie and masters through their ludicrous fear of danger. In small

[1] The placard calling the meeting reads:—" NOTICE TO THE WORKERS. Although there have already appeared numerous appeals demanding that the requirements of the workers shall be met, we cannot regard them as at all satisfactory, since none has been published through our instrumentality. We therefore invite representatives of all workers to meet for a general discussion on Thursday, 6th April, at 8 p,m., in the Masschen district, Sebastian Street, in order to choose a reliable committee from among ourselves to secure measures which will permanently safeguard the workers' interests." It was signed by the workers, Engelhardt, Fromm, Lückow, Müller and Michaelis.

[2] From here onwards the words are the actual minutes of the proceedings kept by the *Arbeiter-Club*. Quoted in A. Wolff: *Berliner Revolutionschronik*, II., p. 136. The introductory sentences are Wolff's.

workshop meetings one will learn, and we must particularly instruct ourselves in politics. Political knowledge affects our daily bread.

Assessor (junior magistrate) *Jung* in a lengthy speech drew attention to the importance of the forthcoming elections, and called upon them at once to make lists and appoint such delegates as would select deputies after the heart of the people.

Krüger (engineer) insisted upon higher wages and restriction of hours as a rapid remedy for distress; but this would, of course, duly be brought about by means of propaganda, and a permanent improvement was not to be expected from it. The means of life should be provided more cheaply. The speaker then went into great detail concerning the social position of the workers and indicated that it was his intention to concentrate attention on this.

Vögel (a labourer): Our wishes have been flouted by the Commission; these men did not have our confidence, they have been bribed, their one desire is to oppress us; these people are associated with those who for some paltry reward instigated the miserable crime against the Political Club; they are wolves in sheep's clothing. We must firmly oppose such men as these and elect representatives who will be worthy of our trust.

G. A. Schlöffel (student and editor of the *Volksfreund*): The day labourers have chosen me as their speaker; I speak in a just cause. You will be astonished at what I am going to say to you. I say to you that all attempts to alleviate the distress are in vain. You want the reduction of working hours and increases of wages: these will lead to nothing, for they will result merely in a rise in the cost of living.—Here the speaker lost his thread in an obscure dissertation on the economic situation, and the audience did not seem to be in any way astonished, for it cried out, "We have heard all that before!" But the speaker raised himself, and, explaining that landed property was in the wrong hands, he inveighed against the power of capital. "We must crush capital! We must join together and make away with the weapons of our opponents! (Loud applause.) The possessing classes refuse to work, and therefore need to carry arms. (Hear, hear!) They would rather be oppressed by tyrants than join forces with the workers. To become 'independent' means simply to do no more work. (Hear, hear!) Yes, we must crush the power of the money-bags, we must work against the nobility, who now fanaticize the peasantry. We must strike a heavy blow. (Continuous applause.) I propose: Unity against the power of wealth, the seizure of arms, and joint action with the People's Union."—The president accepted the proposal to co-operate with the People's Union, and the meeting followed him.

Herr Klahm (sweetmeat manufacturer) desired to instruct the working classes on the impossibility of raising wages. Tumult throughout the hall: "Down with the enemy of the workers!" The President calmed the assembly, and Dr. *Löwinson* declared that it was Herr Klahm who provided bread and potatoes for the people. Herr Klahm: "Yes, it is I who secured that a peck of potatoes costs 1 sgr."[1] The speaker indulged in variations on this theme for a considerable time and had in the end to be stopped.

[1] Silbergroschen—one-thirtieth of a thaler (about one penny).

Oppermann: We have still no rallying-cry. I propose: "United, firm and strong!" *Löwinson* spoke on class-distinctions and their injustice. "The workers must be on top. If only we join together into little groups, and these groups stand firmly by one another, who," he asked, raising his voice, "who can stand against us?"

The meeting grew stormy, but the President strove hard to secure order and after several others had made speeches of no great importance, the President concluded by saying: "Calm yourselves and don't be too hasty. We can't achieve a revolution in a day; revolutions break out spontaneously as soon as the old regime has grown rotten and intolerable. Therefore go calmly!" The assembled delegates were requested to meet in the same place on Sunday evening.

120 FR. HECKER ON THE FIRST BADEN REVOLT.

The
RISING
of the
PEOPLE in BADEN
for the
GERMAN REPUBLIC
in the spring of 1848.
by
Dr. Fr. *Hecker.*

* * *

Basle, 1848.

* * *

INTRODUCTION

THE Monarchy has used every possible means to decry the first republican revolt, but it has not succeeded in achieving its purpose. Our cause, set back but not conquered, is now widely known in the huts of the peasantry and the dwellings of the citizens. It lives in the hearts of the people as a glorious tradition. It adorns the graves of our fallen brothers, and when the flowers on those graves have faded in the evening time, the morning sees them replaced by fresh ones from an unknown hand. In the lonely huts on the mountains, in the houses in the valleys, there hang by thousands the pictures of the rebel leaders; their names are remembered in the people's songs, they live and resound even in the games and the songs of the children.

Our faith in the purity and the justice of our cause made us take the banner in our hands; the hope of freeing a great people from the tyranny of a thousand years led us to gird on our swords; relying on a powerful rising of brave men we marched forwards through the mountains. No base passion drove us on, no self-seeking, no selfish ambition; we were the children of the people and

were fighting for our own. Many of us may languish on a foreign soil. Many of us may go home to everlasting freedom before our great task is accomplished. But when at last there are neither princes nor lords, when the generations succeed each other beneath the People's banner of liberty, equality and fraternity, when the father relates to his sons as they grow old enough to bear arms the tale of the days gone by, and when a proud people rejoices in its daily labours, and is conscious of its own power, then the sons of the people will be remembered who first declared war on the tyranny of the princes and led the way to the German Republic.

* * * * * * * * *

Muttenz, in the Canton of Basle. HECKER.
Spring, 1848.

1848 April 12: Hecker proclaims the Republic and marches from Constance to Kandern.
1848 April 20: Hecker's forces dispersed.
1848 April: Progress of the Revolution checked generally.
1848 May 15: Demonstration in Vienna. Constitution promised. Emperor flees to Innsbruck.
1848 May 18: Inauguration of the Frankfurt Assembly.
1848 June 26: Socialist revolt in Paris defeated.
1848 June 30: Archduke John of Austria elected Regent of Germany by the Frankfurt Assembly.
1848 August 23: Battle between the Vienna National Guard and the unemployed.
1848 September 4: Punctation of Malmö announced to the Frankfurt Assembly.
1848 September 14: Assembly accepts Malmö Punctation.
1848 September 17: Revolutionary meeting in Frankfurt against the Punctation.
1848 September 18: Revolutionaries attack the Paulskirche in Frankfurt. Prussian and Austrian troops suppress the revolt.
1848 September 21: Struve leads a Republican rising in Baden.

121 (STRUVE'S) "REPUBLICAN OFFICIAL GAZETTE," No. 1

Headquarters, Lörrach,
September 22, 1848.

CONTENTS.

1) Appeal to the German People. 2) Administrative Instruction to all Burgomasters. 3) Proclamation regarding feudal dues. 4) Law regarding Tariffs.

APPEAL TO THE GERMAN PEOPLE.

THE battle of the people with its oppressors has begun. Even in the streets of Frankfort a/M, the seat of the futile Central Power and of the chattering constitutional Parliament, the people have been attacked with grape-shot. Only the sword can now save the German people. If reaction triumphs in Frankfort, then Germany will be conquered and enslaved in so-called legal bonds, more terribly even than could be done in the bloodiest battle.

To arms, People of Germany! Only a republic can lead us to the goal we strive for.

Long live the German republic!

Lörrach, 21 September, 1848.

In the name of the Provisional Government,

GUSTAV STRUVE.

Commandant of the Headquarters,

M. W. LÖWENFELS.

GERMAN REPUBLIC.

Welfare, Education, Freedom for All!

Headquarters, Lörrach, 21 September, 1848.

Instructions to all Burgomasters.

All Burgomasters are made personally responsible that:—

[*Beacon lights are maintained to guide the republican army. All persons of the royalist party are seized and their goods confiscated. All available fighting men are secured and provisions of all kinds made available for them.*]

In the name of the provisional government,

G. STRUVE.

Commandant of Headquarters,

M. W. LÖWENFELS.

Secretary:
KARL BLIND.

GERMAN REPUBLIC.

Welfare, Education and Freedom for all.

In the name of the German people the provisional government of Germany decrees as follows:—

1. All medieval feudal burdens, all personal services, all tithes, all feudal rents, all compulsory labour, or whatever other names they may bear, are forthwith abolished without compensation. * * *

2. All dues hitherto payable to the State, to the Church, or to the aristocratic landlords, cease from this day: a progressive income tax which will not affect smaller incomes will replace all the former taxes: only the tariffs at the frontiers will remain for the present.

3. All the lands of the State, of the Church, and of all citizens fighting on the royalist side, go provisionally (subject to later arrangements for equalisation) to the parish in which they lie.

4. In order to ensure the carrying out of the provisions contained in the foregoing articles, a general rising of the people is being arranged. All men capable of bearing arms between 18 and 40 years of age are seizing weapons to save their Fatherland from danger.

From to-day military law is in force, until the German people has secured its freedom.

In the name of the provisional government of Germany.

G. STRUVE.

Secretary: KARL BLIND.

Headquarters, Lörrach, 1st day of the German Republic.
21 September, 1848.

GERMAN REPUBLIC.

Welfare, Education and Freedom for all.

Headquarters, Lörrach,
22 September, 1848.

The tariff, which was raised by notice in the Baden Government Press of 15 September, 1848, No. 62, is hereby reduced by 10 per cent.

The Administrator of Taxation, Christian Müller, is hereby notified to act accordingly.

In the name of the provisional government.

G. STRUVE.

Secretary: KARL BLIND.

A certified copy sent to Citizen Administrator Ch. Müller for execution.

1848 September 24: Defeat of Struve's followers at Staufen in Breingau.
1848 October 5: Decree issued by the Emperor dissolving the Hungarian Diet and appointing the Croat leader, Jellachich, military dictator.
1848 October 6: Vienna Revolution. Dispatch of troops to Jellachich prevented. Emperor flies. Minister of War murdered. Revolutionaries in control.

122 PROCEEDINGS OF THE AUSTRIAN DIET.[1]

7th Oct. 10 a.m.

INFORMATION received of the emperor's flight from his palace at Schönbrunn. The House appoints a Committee to enquire into the truth of this statement.

11.30 a.m.

The Minister of Finance, Herr Kraus, informs the House of the emperor's departure.

[*Ascending to the tribune, he said*:]

"An hour since, one of the guards of the palace handed me a sealed letter which contained a manifesto from the emperor, in nearly the following language:

1 From Stiles, *op. cit.*, II, 110

'I have done everything that a sovereign could do for the benefit of my people: I have renounced the absolute power left me by my ancestors. In the month of May I was forced to quit the palace of my fathers, and afterwards I came back without any other guarantee than my confidence in my people. A small faction, strong from its boldness, has urged things to the furthest extremity; pillage and crime reign in Vienna; and the Minister of War has been murdered. I have confidence in God and my right, and I quit the neighbourhood of my capital to find means to afford assistance to my oppressed people. Let those who love Austria and her liberty, rally round the emperor.' "

[*Kraus had refused to countersign this, as violating his oath. He left the matter to the Diet's decision, which appointed a Committee, which reported as follows:*]

1. That Ministers Hornbostel, Dobblhof, and Kraus, discharge temporarily all the functions of the Cabinet, and make proposals to his majesty to complete the ministry.

2. That a proclamation be addressed to the people and a memorial sent to his majesty, on the events of the previous day.

3. That the House invest itself with both the deliberative and executive powers, and that this resolution be communicated to the provinces by special commissioners. [*Report adopted.*]

8th October.

[*The Diet issues the following manifesto:*]

1. The Diet, which in its quality of Constituent Assembly, cannot be dissolved before the completion of its mission, also declares that it will not dissolve under the most threatening circumstances, but will remain firmly faithful to its duty.

2. The Diet is an indivisible body: it represents all the different peoples of Austria who have sent representatives to it.

3. The Diet is, conformably to the imperial manifesto of the 6th of June, and to the free election of the people, the only legal and constitutional organ of the union between the constitutional monarch and the sovereign people, for the defence of the inviolable liberty of the people and of the hereditary throne.

4. The Diet, being composed of the free representatives of a free people, will not impose a moral restraint on any deputy to compel him to remain.

5. The Diet will remain with firmness on constitutional ground, to defend by legal and constitutional measures the country, the liberty of the people and the hereditary throne.

6. The Diet invites all its members who are absent, either with or without leave, to return to their posts within a fortnight at the farthest.

1848 October 7 onwards: Slav army collected under Windischgrätz to crush Vienna.

1848 October 23: Windischgrätz besieges Vienna

1848 October 30: Hungarian relief force defeated at Schwechat.
1848 October 30, 31, November 1: Assault of Vienna.
1848 November 1: Fall of Vienna. End of the Austrian Revolution.
1848 November 9: Prussian Assembly dissolved. Passive resistance fails. End of the Prussian Revolution.
1848 December 2: Ferdinand abdicates, Francis Joseph becoming Austrian Emperor.
1849 March 4: Austrian Diet dissolved. Austria withdraws from Germany.
1849 March 28: Frankfurt Assembly offers the crown of Germany to the King of Prussia. Refused.
1849 April 12: Assembly declares its constitution the law of the land. Prussian, Hanoverian and Saxon Chambers assent and are dissolved. Prussia calls on the Governments to revise the constitution. Right begins to leave Frankfurt.
1849 April-May: Revolts in Saxony and the Rhineland.
1849 May 10-11: Republic proclaimed in Baden and the Palatinate.

123 RESOLUTIONS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY ASSEMBLY, MAY, 1849

THE (REVOLUTIONARY) NATIONAL ASSEMBLY AT OFFENBURG.

* * * * * * * * *

Resolved:—

1. [*The Government must recognize and support the Frankfurt Constitution.*]

2. The present Ministry must be dissolved at once, and Citizen Brentano, the High Court Advocate at Mannheim, and Citizen Büger, Reichstag representative for Constance, are to be charged with the formation of a new Ministry.

3. At the same time as the various local Chambers are dissolved, a Diet must be called together to draw up a Constitution. * * *

4. Universal arming of the people at the public expense must be instituted straight away. * * *

5. Political exiles are to be recalled. All civil and military political prisoners are to be set free, and all political trials to be dropped. * * *

6. Courts-martial must be abolished.

7. Free election of officers must be established in the army.

8. We demand the immediate fusion of the standing army with the militia.

9. All [*feudal*] burdens on the land must be removed without compensation.

10. The municipalities must be declared absolutely independent both as regards their own finances and the election of their members: a new election for municipal representatives must be held at once for the whole country.

11. [*All the decisions of the Karlsruhe Chamber since* 17 *January*, 1849, *are to be declared null and void.*]

12. A jury system is to be established at once. * * *

13. The old administrative bureaucracy must go. * * *

14. The establishment of a National Bank for industry, trade and agriculture as a protection against the power of the great capitalists.

15. Abolition of the old system of taxation and the introduction of a progressive income-tax alongside the tariffs.

16. The creation of a huge national pension fund, from which any citizen who becomes incapable of work can be supported. * * *

Signed L. BRENTANO.

[*and* 21 *other members of the National Committee of the People's Clubs, including* 4 *representatives of the soldiers.*]

Countersigned in the name of the National Assembly.

GOEGG.

Offenburg. 13 May, '49.

1849 May 30: Frankfort Rump retires to Wurtemburg.
1849 June 18: Frankfurt Rump expelled from Wurtemburg.
1849 July 23: Fall of Rastatt. End of the German Revolution.

Section V

Ireland, 1848

124	Resolutions Moved by W. S. O'Brien, February 3	1848
125	From John Mitchel's *Letters to Ulstermen*, April and May	1848
126	*The Irish Felon* on the Suppression of the June Revolt in Paris, July 1	1848
127	From J. Fintan Lalor's *The Faith of a Felon*, July 8	1848

Introduction

THE documents appended in themselves indicate fairly clearly the character of the Young Ireland movement of 1848. The Right (No. 124) represented not only the richer bourgeoisie, but more particularly the Nationalism of the larger Catholic landlords, and was essentially timid, fearing the revolutionary activities of the peasantry nearly as much as the English Government. The programme of the Left (Nos. 125 and 127) was merely agrarian and represented the desires of an impoverished peasantry, which was forced to look on the French Communists as allies, but had all the peasant's rooted fear of Communism (No. 126). That the agitation came to a head at this point was due not only to the Continental upheavals, but also directly to the terrible Irish famine of 1845-7. It only remains to be noted that after the arrest in June of its strongest man, John Mitchel, the movement collapsed in a manner which can only be described as ludicrous. The leaders of the Right did not refrain from revolutionary speeches, yet could not summon up enough courage to call an actual revolt: they suppressed and discouraged popular revolts to release the prisoners, with the result that the British Government was able to try and sentence them at its leisure.[1]

[1] See J. Connolly: *Labour in Ireland*, chap. xiv; Dillon: *Life of John Mitchel*.

Documents

124 RESOLUTIONS MOVED BY W. SMITH O'BRIEN AT THE MEETING OF "THE IRISH CONFEDERATION," OF FEBRUARY 3, 1848 [1]

I. Resolved—That inasmuch as letters published by two members of this council[2] have brought into question the principles of the Irish Confederation, and have given rise to an imputation, that we are desirous to produce a general disorganization of society in this country, and to overthrow social order, we deem it right again to place before the public the following fundamental rule as that which constitutes the basis of action proposed to our fellow-countrymen by the Irish Confederation:—

RULE.

"That a society be now formed under the title of 'The Irish Confederation' for the purpose of protecting our national interests, and obtaining the legislative independence of Ireland, by the force of opinion, by the combination of all classes of Irishmen, and the exercise of all the political, social and moral influences within our reach."

II. That (under present circumstances) the only hope of the liberation of this country lies in a movement in which all classes and creeds of Irishmen shall be fairly represented, and by which the interests of none shall be endangered.

III. That inasmuch as English legislation threatens all Irishmen with a common ruin, we entertain a confident hope their common necessities will speedily unite Irishmen in an effort to get rid of it.

IV. That we earnestly deprecate the expression of any sentiments in the Confederation calculated to repel or alarm any section of our fellow-countrymen.

V. That we disclaim, as we have disclaimed, any intention of involving our country in civil war, or of invading the just rights of any portion of its people.

VI. That the Confederation has not recommended, nor does it recommend, resistance to the payment of rents and rates; but, on the contrary, unequivocally condemns such recommendations.

VII. That, in protesting against the disarmament of the Irish people under the Coercion Bill lately enacted, and in maintaining that the right to bear arms and to use them for legitimate purposes is one of the primary attributes of liberty we have had no intention or desire to encourage any portion of the population of this country in the perpetration of crimes such as those which have recently brought disgrace upon the Irish people, and which have tended in no trifling degree to retard the success of our efforts in the cause of national freedom.

[1] These may be taken as representing the policy of the Right. O'Brien threatened to resign if they were not carried. They were, however, carried, against John Mitchel's opposition, by 129 votes.

[2] Mitchel and Reilly.

VIII. That to hold out to the Irish people the hope, that in this present broken and divided condition, they can liberate their country by an appeal to arms, and consequently to divert them from constitutional action, would be, in our opinion, a fatal misdirection of the public mind.

IX. That this Confederation was established to attain an Irish parliament by the combination of classes and by the force of an opinion exercised in constitutional operations, and that no means of a contrary character can be recommended or promoted through its organization while its fundamental rules remain unaltered.

X. That while we deem it right thus emphatically to disavow the principles propounded in the publications referred to in the resolutions, we at the same time equally distinctly repudiate all right to control *the private opinions* of any member of our body, provided they do not affect the legal or moral responsibility of the Irish Confederation.

125 FROM JOHN MITCHEL: "LETTERS TO ULSTERMEN"

(*a*) From the "*United Irishman*" of April 29th, 1848.

MY good friends, what Irish Repealers really want is, that they may have leave to live, and not die; they want to be made sure that what they sow they shall also reap; they want a home and a foothold on a soil, that they may not be naked and famishing beggars in their own land. In one word—they demand Ireland for the Irish—not for the Irish gentry alone. They desire not to rob the Protestants, but to bridle the exterminators, be they Protestant or Catholic (and some of the cruellest are Catholics). They demand back not forfeited estates, but the long-withheld and denied right of human beings. And inasmuch as Irish landlordism is maintained here by the English connection, and the English connection is perpetuated by Irish landlordism, they can see no way to put an end to either but by destroying both.

Now, this—this and nothing else—is the "Repeal" that stirs and rouses and thrills through the Ancient Irish nation from sea to sea. It is essentially not only a national movement, but also—why not admit it?—a class movement. You have heard of romantic young enthusiasts, or constitutional idiots, inspired by Grattan's rigmarole denying with chivalrous indignation that there is any question of class against class involved here. Perish the thought! They say Irish gentlemen armed for the honour of Ireland in '82, and shall they not do so again? Think of Charlemont! Think of Lenister! Names to conjure with! These romantic enthusiasts and constitutional idiots refuse to see that "Irish gentlemen" acted then as they act now upon the true gentlemanlike instinct. They armed for Ireland and rents, places and jobs then; they arm for England and rents, places and jobs now. "Why should they not join us? Why not lead us?" Ah! Why? Simply, gentlemen—it is a hard saying—simply because their interest is the other way—because they know that the end of British dominion here would be the end of them.

No wonder, therefore, that they try to conceal from you the true nature of the Irish movement; no wonder the grand masters and their agents, bailiffs, and bog bailiffs exhort you to resist "Popery" and withstand the woman who sitteth upon the seven hills.[1] They would fain draw away your eyes in any direction—to Rome, to Jericho, to Timbuctoo, but at all events from your own fields and haggards.

(*b*) From the *United Irishman*, May 13th, 1848.

My friends, the people's sovereignty—the land and sea and air of Ireland for the people of Ireland—this is the gospel that the heavens and the earth are preaching, and that all hearts are secretly burning to embrace. Give up for ever that old interpretation you put upon the word "Repeal." Repeal is no priest movement; it is no sectarian movement; it is no money swindle; nor "eighty-two" delusions; nor puffery; nor O'Connellism; or Mullaghmast "green cap" stage play; nor loud-sounding inanity of any sort got up for any man's profit or praise. It is the mighty, passionate struggle of a nation hastening to be born into new national life, in the which unspeakable throes all the parts and powers and elements of our Irish existence—our confederations, our Protestant repeal associations, our tenant-right societies, our clubs, cliques, and committees—amidst confusions enough, and the saddest jostling and jumbling, are all inevitably tending, however unconsciously, to one and the same illustrious goal—not a local legislature—not a return to "our ancient constitution"—not a golden link or a patch-work Parliament or a college green chapel-of-ease to St. Stephen's—but an Irish Republic, one and indivisible.

And how are we to meet that day? In arms, my countrymen, in arms. Thus and not otherwise have ever nations of men sprung to liberty and power. But why do I reason thus with you—with you, the Irish of Ulster, who have never denied the noble creed and sacraments of manhood? You have not been schooled for forty years in the fatal cant of moral force; you have not been utterly debauched and emasculated by the clap-trap platitudes of public meetings and the empty glare of "imposing demonstrations," you have not yet learned the litany of slaves and the whine of beaten hounds and the way to die a coward's death. No; let once the great idea of your country's destiny seize on you, my kinsmen, and the way will be plain before you as a pike-staff twelve feet long.

* * * * * * * * *

I will speak plainly. There is now growing on the soil of Ireland a wealth of grain, and roots, and cattle far more than enough to sustain in life and in comfort all the inhabitants of the island. That wealth must not leave us another year, not until every grain of it is fought for in every stage, from the tying of the sheaf to the loading of the ship. And the effort necessary to that simple art of self-preservation will at one and the same blow prostrate British dominion and landlordism altogether. 'Tis but the one act of volition—if we resolve but to live we make our country a free and sovereign state.

[1] Church of Rome.

Will you not gird up your loins for this great national struggle, and stand with your countrymen for life and land? Will you, the sons of a warlike race, the inheritors of conquering memories—with the arms of freemen in all your homes, and relics of the gallant Republicans of ninety-eight for ever before your eyes—will you stand folding your hands in helpless "loyalty," and while every nation in Christendom is seizing on its birth-right with armed hand will you take patiently, with your rations of yellow meal, your inevitable portion of eternal contempt?

If this be your determination, Protestants of Ulster, then make haste; sign addressses of loyalty and confidence in Lord Clarendon, and protest, with that other lord, your unalterable attachment to "our venerable institutions."

JOHN MITCHEL.

126 "THE IRISH FELON," DUBLIN, JULY 1. (ON THE SUPPRESSION OF THE JUNE REVOLT IN PARIS)

* * * We are not Communists—we abhor communism; for the same reasons we abhor poor-law systems and systems founded on the absolute sovereignty of wealth. Communism destroys the independence and dignity of labour, makes the working-man a state pauper, and takes his manhood from him. But communism or no communism, these 70,000 workmen had a clear right to existence—they had the best right to existence of any men in France; and if they could have asserted that right by arms they would have been fully justified. The social system, in which a man, willing to work, is compelled to starve is a blasphemy, an anarchy and no system. For the present, these victims of monarchic rule, disowned by the Republic, are conquered. Ten thousand are slain, twenty perhaps doomed to the Marqueses. But for all that the rights of labour are not conquered, and will not and cannot be conquered. Again and again the labourer will rise up against the idler—the working men will meet this bourgeoisie, and grapple and war with them, till their equality is established not in word but in existence.

There will be no peace to France till this is done. She must either subdue the children she abandons by slaughtering them in her capital; or else turn them out to graze on the battle plains of her enemies.

There is another lesson from this Parisian revolt: of all the instances of street fighting, this is the greatest. Seventy thousand men; a poor fraction of the people; disowned and opposed by the people, maintained against the united forces of the Republic numbering at one time 200,000 men, commanded by perhaps the most successful and the ablest generals of Europe, a mortal combat of fifteen hours without yielding an inch; and maintained it with such success as to compel the troops, having expended all their ammunition, to retire leaving cannon, and flags, and generals behind them, and 15,000 men dead or wounded. One may judge of this wondrous execution of guns from behind barricades, by recollecting that 15,000 men, the

number put *hors de combat* by the insurgents, is exactly twice the garrison of Dublin—a fact worth totting up in our memory now and then.

T. D. R[*eilly*].

127 FROM "THE FAITH OF A FELON": J. FINTAN LALOR, JULY 8

The opinions I then stated, and which I yet stand firm to, are these:—

1. That in order to save their own lives, the occupying tenants of the soil of Ireland ought, next autumn, to refuse all rent and arrears of rent then due, beyond and except the value of the overplus of harvest produce remaining in their hands after having deducted and reserved a due and full provision for their own subsistence during the next ensuing twelve months.

2. That they ought to refuse and resist being made beggars, landless and houseless, under the English law of ejection.

3. That they ought further, on *principle*, to refuse ALL rent to the present usurping proprietors, until the people, the true proprietors (or lords paramount, in legal parlance) have, in national congress or convention, decided *what* rents they are to pay, and *to whom* they are to pay them.

4. And that the people, on grounds of *policy* and *economy*, ought to decide (as a general rule admitting of reservations) that these rents shall be paid to *themselves*, the people, for public purposes, and for behoof and benefit of them, the entire general people.

These are the principles, as clearly and fully stated as limit of time will allow, which I advise Ireland to adopt at once and at once to arm for. Should the people accept and adhere to them, the English Government will then have to choose whether to surrender the Irish landlords, or to support them with the armed power of the empire.

Epilogue

128 The Republican Manifesto of Kossuth, Ledru-Rollin, and Mazzini, Issued on the Fall of Sebastopol during the Crimean War, 1855.

Introduction

THE leaders of the middle-class parties of 1848, and their Republican followers, did not in any way accommodate themselves to the new conditions. Mazzini tried to gain influence in the International, but quickly withdrew, while Kossuth and Ledru-Rollin allowed their reputations to crumble away—Kossuth by his anti-Socialism and his exaggerated theatrical behaviour, Ledru-Rollin by his complete inertia.

We must bid farewell to them with this last manifesto. In it we hear them bravely concealing the knowledge of their own impotence and demanding agitation, suppression of discussion within their movement, and instant revolt for the sake of—nationality, individual liberty and freedom of association. This complete non-comprehension of the rising working-class movement left them stranded. The old Governments, with the single exception of Russia, began to feel the effects of the Industrial Revolution and to make terms with the aspirations of the employing classes. Instead of fighting, the two classes—Land and Capital, Rent and Profit—coalesced, and opposition between them, except on minor points, ceased.

Don Emilio Castelar, a distinguished Spanish Republican, once wrote: "All that we have defended, the Conservatives have realised," and went on bitterly to reflect how a Conservative, Deák, had realised Kossuth's ideal of Hungarian autonomy; a Russian Emperor the Republican idea of liberating the serfs; a Conservative, Cavour, Mazzini's ideal of Italian unity. The Republicans of Frankfurt formed the ideal of German unity: an Imperialist, Bismarck, realised it. The French Republic was finally established by Thiers.

Essentially, this is true. The actual needs and demands of the middle-class were satisfied peacefully, and the only remaining revolutionary force was the Workers' International

Document

128 CLOSE OF THE "MANIFESTO OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY," ISSUED AFTER THE FALL OF SEBASTOPOL IN SEPTEMBER, 1855.

YES, therein, above all is our force. Everywhere, Royalty denies national life. Revolution alone can say to it, Arise! be sacred and flourish beneath the protection of thy brethren. Revolution alone can resolve the vital question of the nationalities, which superficial intelligences continue to misunderstand, but which we know to be the organisation of Europe. It alone can give the baptism of humanity to those races who claim to be associated in the common work and to whom the sign of their nationality is denied; it alone can regenerate Italy to a third life, and say to Hungary and Poland *Exist:* it alone can unite Spain and Portugal into an Iberian Republic; create a young Scandinavia; give a material existence to Illyria; organise Greece; extend Switzerland to the dimensions of an Alpine Confederacy, and group in a free fraternity and make an oriental Switzerland of Servia, Roumania, Bulgaria and Bosnia. And it alone can harmonize (above this real European equilibrium—sole guarantee of peaceful progress) the two grand ideas which now lead the world and which are named, *Liberty and Association.* Brethren, doubt not of your strength, your programme responds to all the instincts of the epoch. For it men struggle, suffer and die on every point of Europe. * * *

The *mot d'ordre* we have declared is *Liberty for all, Association of all.* It excludes nothing, it comprises all. To go beyond, is tyranny.

What centre of action would or could exercise such tyranny?

It belongs not to a few individuals, nor even to the entire acting party, to decide on the practical measures by which the revolution shall remedy the evils under which the masses are suffering, the striking inequalities of the actual social system; that will be the work of the revolution itself, of which we can only be the initiators. From the collective inspiration, and out of the beating heart of the peoples, when they shall have made out of the shroud that now covers them a labarum of victory, must spring the WORD of the epoch. For life engenders life: liberty begets intelligence, and to the man who clasps the hand of his brethren in a burst of devotion, enthusiasm and triumphant love, is given a revelation of truth denied to the isolated slave who dare not break his chain.

* * * The common and definite aim—evident to every uncorrupted intelligence, is the republican form of government.

The means are not to be found in absolute individual liberty and discussion, but in association, organization, collective labour, discipline, abnegation and devotion. Anarchy never gained a battle. Discussion is impotent and useless, when addressed to peoples with the brand of slavery on their brow. Give

them back the free air of heaven, the purifying breath of liberty, the plenitude of their faculties, the sacred enthusiasm of the human being that asserts his right, and your words will then bring forth acts.

At the present day, action alone can restore the holiness of speech. The Greeks of the Lower Empire discussed and died—the sabre of Mahomet struck in silence. * * *

Insurrection will engender insurrection and the first victory produced ten others, on ten different points. There is not a single nation which may not, by an energetic and powerful act of will, be the cause of the salvation of the world.

KOSSUTH.
LEDRU ROLLIN.
JOSEPH MAZZINI.

Chapter V

The Commune of Paris

France: The Commune of 1871

129	*La Patrie en Danger*, No. 50, by L. A. Blanqui, October 30	1870
130	Manifesto of the Central Committee, March 20	1871
131	The Commune: First Proclamations, March 29	1871
132	J. B. Millière: "The Revolution of 1871" in *La Commune*, April 3	1871
133	The Commune: "To the Departments," April 6	1871
134	Decree on the Vendôme Column, April 12	1871
135	Decree on Co-operative Workshops, April 16	1871
136	Jules Nostag: "Country-Humanity" in *La Révolution*, April 16	1871
137	The Commune: Programme, April 19	1871
138	Mme. A. Léo. "Revolution Without Women" in *La Sociale*, May 8	1871
139	P. Grousset: Official Manifesto "To the Great Towns," May 15	1871
140	Declaration of the Minority, May 15	1871
141	Ch. Delescluze's Last Proclamation, May 22	1871
142	Manifesto of the General Council of the International: "The Civil War in France," May 30	1871

Introduction

THE Manifesto of the International, which is reprinted among the following documents (No. 142), makes it superfluous to give in detail the prelude to the Commune or the history of the Commune itself. Hence, the following remarks will deal almost entirely with points omitted by Marx in his account, or general considerations outside the scope of his pamphlet.

The need for military glory, essential to the existence of the Government of Louis Bonaparte, led directly to the outbreak of war between Prussia and France in 1870.[1] The bourgeoisie acquiesced gladly, and a general fever of chauvinism inflamed all France. Never was confidence less justified. By August 9, 1870, the French armies had sustained three serious defeats in six days and Bonaparte's throne was tottering. He himself took the nominal command in a last attempt to save his Empire. Utterly incapable of leading an army, or of bringing order or competence into the chaos and corruption that his General Staff had produced, he met worse disaster at Sedan on September 2, and surrendered both himself and his army. With Bazaine shut up in Metz, France was now practically defenceless. On the news of this calamity the people of Paris rose and proclaimed the Republic: certain deputies of the Left accepted its mandate to form a Government of National Defence.

This Government, with the exception of Dorian and Gambetta, was one of the least respectable that Paris had ever known. Two courses were open to it after the investment of Paris; it had the unquestioning support of everybody, and could do what it chose. It could either make a serious effort to defend Paris, or it could express openly its true opinion that any attempt at defence would be unwise, and insist on either resigning or carrying on the war in the only way it thought practicable. It did neither. It undertook a mock defence of Paris, since the Parisians were eager to do their best to defend the Republic. General Trochu, its agent, flung away his men in useless sorties, mismanaged and disorganised the National Guard, and did not in any way make the least attempt to concert a serious defence, but sent out men on hopeless attacks in order to satisfy Paris by a little blood-letting. That this policy was deliberate was shown by later discoveries of correspondence, etc. It very quickly disgusted the true Republicans and all those who were serious about the defence. L. A. Blanqui (No. 129) in particular exposed it as even anti-Republican, and on October 31, 1870, on the news of the surrender of Bazaine, the more intelligent members of the Parisian proletariat expelled the Government and set up a new one, which had exactly the same title to existence as the other. It was not a Blanquist government—the names show that[2]

[1] It was the universal belief that Bonaparte was solely responsible, and it is the common belief that concerns us. We now know that Bismarck desired the war quite as much as Bonaparte and considerably facilitated its outbreak, to say the least.

[2] They are: Dorian (member of the old Government), Louis Blanc, Ledru-Rollin (who had both "moved to the Right" during their 20 years of exile), Victor Hugo, Raspail, Delescluze, Pyat, Blanqui, and Millière.

—but merely a Government of competent men to replace incompetents, for the one purpose of sustaining the siege. However, the moderate members discreetly hid themselves and Blanqui alone occupied the Hôtel de Ville for the minute. Many battalions of the National Guard, with the usual inconsequence of popular forces, had gone home when Ferré, a member of the Government, returned with some Breton soldiers. It looked as though civil war might break out, and Blanqui was not prepared to take any steps that would lead to it. The two parties, therefore, came to an amicable arrangement by which Blanqui withdrew from the Hôtel de Ville upon the express promise of the Government to hold elections in Paris at once. Blanqui believed, that this would mean, not the success of his party, but the substitution of men who were prepared seriously to defend the Republic in the place of the criminally negligent Government in power.

The Government also knew this, and hence proceeded to break its promise at once. It had learnt from Bonaparte how to "wangle" a plébiscite and proceeded to hold one at once. It placed before the electors, who were confined to saying "Yes" or "No," a question[1] which practically forced them to vote, if discontented, against the Defence Government, and provided them with no alternative. The fact that the *de facto* Government of the reformers had actually consisted only of Blanqui had so much alarmed the Moderates that they preferred to vote "Yes." Having thus made the question a choice between themselves, as Moderates, and the Extremists, and evaded the individual substitution of better men for themselves, the Government secured its plébiscite,[2] and the only result was the abandonment of the negotiations which had been begun with the Prussians. It arrested 25 Extremists for desiring to do what it had done on September 4, but made no attempt to organise the defence.

Meanwhile, Paris starved and watched Trochu wasting his men, until, on January 22, Trochu declared further defence impossible. Paris felt she had been tricked, there was a rising of some battalions of the National Guard, which was defeated, and the Moderates hastily replaced Trochu by General Vinoy, who suppressed six Republican newspapers, but otherwise differed little from his predecessor, and, indeed, seemed far more anxious to overawe the National Guard than to attack the Prussians.

Léon Gambetta, who had escaped in a balloon to the Provinces, had, on the other hand, been carrying on the war with energy. The recital of his great efforts in raising fresh armies and stirring the country to vigorous resistance belongs rather to the national history of France: here we are more concerned with the effect of his actions upon the elections to the National Assembly of February 8. He believed entirely in the rallying of all classes to the Republic. He refused to punish or even discharge the most guilty of the Bonapartist officials. His armies were, therefore, rotten with discontent, and their officers in many cases boasted of their reluctance to bring their men into

[1] "Those who wish that the Government of National Defence should be maintained will vote: 'Yes.'"

[2] 322,000 to 63,000.

battle. His heroic efforts, therefore, met with little success. On the Loire, General d'Aurelles de Paladine—a Bonapartist—was suspiciously incompetent, and at last the Provinces became sick of this interminable bloodshed in the name of the Republic. Hence when on January 27 the Government at last negotiated an armistice and summoned an Assembly to conclude peace, in the Provinces, on the one hand, the Bonapartist machine was intact and the peasant was imbued with the belief that the Republic meant the continuation of a bloody and useless war. Therefore, the country districts returned a heavy majority of reactionaries who would at least give peace.[1] They became known as "the Rurals." Paris, on the other hand, feeling that its strength was far from exhausted, and that the Moderates had betrayed it, turned to the party which had proved its merits during the siege and returned Radicals.

The mandate of the "snap" majority which the Clericals and Monarchists had obtained, did not in fact extend farther than the conclusion of peace. But, by means of its agent, Thiers, the Assembly intended to go farther and destroy the chances of a Republic. Of the various blows which it inflicted upon Paris in the first few days of its existence the worst was an order on March 10 that all the rents and bills which had been subject to a moratorium during the siege should be met within *three days*. It was, of course, impossible that this should be done. Nearly all the lower classes of Paris were faced with instant ruin, and the plight of even the upper bourgeoisie may be gathered from the fact that in four days (March 13-17) 150,000 bills were dishonoured.

A little earlier (February 24) the National Guard, refusing to recognise Vinoy, and as much for the purpose of keeping order as of attacking the Monarchists, had elected a Central Committee, which assumed control of the Guard and rejected the authority of the discredited General d'Aurelles de Paladine, whom Thiers sought to force on it. This body, by the force of circumstances, played a very prominent part on March 18, when Thiers provoked civil war by an act of wanton aggression. The existence of an armed Republican force in Paris was the only obstacle to reaction, and for that reason Thiers ordered his forces to seize the cannon of the National Guard on the night of March 17. The attempt miscarried, Generals Lecomte and Thomas, in spite of the intervention of officers in the National Guard, were shot, apparently by their own soldiers, and the members of the Government in Paris fled hastily.

The Central Committee was thus somewhat unexpectedly left the sole authority in the city (No. 130). Having no claims to be a Government, it limited its efforts to securing the Parisian fortresses—except Fort Mont Valerien, which was accidentally lost, with disastrous consequences—and took immediate steps to regularise its position. Eventually it was able to secure the assistance of the Mayors in holding elections on March 26. The advanced party secured a sweeping victory on a low poll, and proclaimed the Commune.

Here we must pause a moment to consider the composition of the Commune

[1] 450 Monarchists in an Assembly of 700.

and the exact meaning of its proclamation—a matter about which there is room for question.[1]

M. Malon,[2] whose authority cannot be questioned, gives the composition of the Commune as follows:—

The International: 17 members: Varlin,* Theisz,* Avrial,* Malon, Langevin, V. Clément,* Duval, Frankel,* Assi, Vaillant, Beslay,* Pindy,* Chalain, Clémence,* Eugene Gerardin,* Lefrançais,* Dereure.[3]

The Central Committee: Bergeret, Ranvier, Billioray, Henri Fortuné, Babick, Géresme, Eudes, Jourde,* Blanchet, Brunel, C. Dupont, Mortier, Ant. Arnauld = 13.

Blanquists: Blanqui (imprisoned by Thiers), Tridon,* Ranc,† Protot, Rigault, Th. Ferré, Chardon, (Eudes) = 8.

Radical Press and Revolutionary Party: Art. Arnould,* J. B. Clément, P. Grousset, J. Miot, Gambon, Pyat, Delescluze, Vermorel,* Flourens, Robinet† = 10.[4]

The Clubs: Amouroux, J. Alix, Champy, E. Clément, Demay, Ch. Gerardin, Goupil,† Ledroit, Lefèvre,† Meillet, Martelet, Ostyn,* Oudet, Puget, Regère, Rastoul, Urbain, Ulysse Parent,† Fruneau,† Parisel, Descamps = 21.

(*The bourgeoisie:* Desmarest, E. Ferry, Nast, Adam, Meline, Rochard, Barré, (Beslay), Loiseau Pinçon, Tirard, Chéron, Leroy, Murat, Marmottan, de Bouteillier = 15. These did not sit, or else resigned.)

This division, although obviously of value, does not give us all that we require. Classification as "members of clubs," etc., does not give us any idea of the candidates' opinions: and M. Malon seems to have described them as "Blanquists" only when no other classification could be found.

[1] There are other methods of analysing the composition of the Commune than the one I have adopted. That which satisfies The Right Hon. H. A. L. Fisher (*The Republican Tradition in Europe*, p. 245) will serve as an example:—

"Of the *Communards* some were anarchists, others Jacobins, others Socialists; others, again, foreign adventurers or escaped gaolbirds. One member of the governing assembly was a Prussian, another a tight-rope dancer, a third a lunatic, a fourth a condemned murderer." The "Prussian" is, perhaps, the Austrian, Leo Frankel, author of the decree on page 297. I do not know who was the criminal who was guilty of being a tight-rope dancer, nor can I identify Dr. Fisher's other two "typical *Communards*." Or, again, there is Dr. T. H. Dyer's standard *History of Modern Europe*. The complete account in this book (VI, 200) runs: "In May, 1871, the Government of Versailles was obliged to capture Paris and overthrow the domination of such men as Cluseret, Delescluze, and Paschal Grousset."

An indication of the proletarian character of the Commune, if such be held necessary, and of the character of the industries represented, can be obtained from General Appert's list of the professions of those condemned by the Versailles courts after the defeat of the Commune. (Quoted in G. Bourgin's *Histoire de la Commune*, p. 191, where it is characterised as *fort approximative*):

Goldsmiths, etc.	528	Cardboard makers	124
Hatters	210	Carpenters	382
Clerks, etc.	1,065	Shoemakers	1,491
Female cutters	206	Gilders	172
Furniture makers	636	Commercial employees	1,598
Instrument makers	98	Whitesmiths	227
Ironfounders	224	Engravers	182
Watchmakers	179	Printers	819
Wallpaper printers	159	Teachers	106
Unskilled labourers	2,901	Stonemasons	2,203
Woodworkers	1,659	Lace and trimming makers	193
Housepainters	863	Binders	106
Stone carvers	283	Metalworkers and engineers	2,664
Tailors	681	Tanners	347
Stone cutters	766	Moulders	157

[2] *La troisième défaite du prolétariat français*, p. 154.

[3] Add later, Andrieux,* Serailler,* Cluseret, Longuet,* Pottier, Johannard.

[4] M. Malon has, surely, omitted here: J. Vallès.*

* Signed the minority protest on May 15. Cf. Lissagaray (*op. cit.*, p. 243).

† Resigned.

The classification as members of the International is, of course, sufficient. For the rest, it must be remarked that Tridon generally co-operated with the members of the International, and that the others may be divided roughly into revolutionaries who were Socialists—generally Blanquists—and revolutionaries who were merely "Red Republicans." These divisions are very hard to trace and shift continually, but they are the easiest for our purpose.

We will consider these sections *seriatim*. First, as regards the International.

The "first International" was founded in St. Martin's Hall, Long Acre. London, on September 28, 1864, as a direct result of the International exhibition of 1862, which had been attended by both French and German workers. It is impossible to write the history of the International here—this would take a book in itself. But, as it was the first organised international Socialist body, its importance is obvious, and some attempt must be made to indicate its character. It only corresponded very slightly to the International as we know it. The Second International is—or was—primarily an assembly of successful politicians, Parliamentary and national in outlook, to whom the Congresses gave merely a larger audience and a more imposing platform for the open expression of Socialist ideas. It was regarded as a nuisance by the existing Governments, no doubt, but could not be thought a danger to society. On the other hand, the old International retained many of the characteristics of a secret society. The bourgeois revolutionaries of 1848—Kossuth, Mazzini and Ledru-Rollin—had made heroic endeavours to keep their movement alive by means of a European Revolutionary Committee situated in London (cf. No. 128), and as their power decayed had to take greater interest in the growth of a conscious proletarian movement. Hence, for a minute it may have looked as though the International might not have a distinctive Socialist character. Major Wolff, Mazzini's secretary, took a large part in its foundation, and in the first years Mazzini's influence was not inconsiderable. These influences stamped themselves on its constitution. Far from being a mere federation of strong, peaceful, national and Parliamentary parties, the International relied upon Committees in various countries, which worked up a frankly revolutionary movement in its support. These tactics were largely responsible for the explosion of the Commune, which was the form of revolution expected by the International and—there seems little doubt—favoured by Marx himself. In England, however, the constitution was different. The Trade Unions were comparatively large and strong, and the International relied upon them for support, which was very generously given.

Gradually the true character of the Socialist International became clear. It devoted itself to spreading and supporting a Trade Union movement on the Continent, with such success that, whereas in 1865 the French and Swiss delegates had declared Continental Trade Unions impossible, at the Congress of 1867 were present over 40 delegates of such Unions. In Switzerland, Belgium, Paris and London the International had organised foreign assistance

and monetary support, which had secured the success of several large strikes. This hitherto unparalleled action had brought it large adhesions in the mass from various working-class bodies, and had created in the employing classes a panic which seems to us merely hysterical, but which gave the International an immense advertisement and spread its influence far beyond the limits of its membership. The followers of Mazzini—mostly Italians—quickly withdrew, and as Congress after Congress cleared the air by eliminating Proudhonism and the various stray co-operative and individualist theories put forward,[1] the scientific Socialism of Dr. Karl Marx began more and more to be the distinctive programme of the International. *Capital*, it must be remembered, was not yet published, nor even after its publication did it influence the International to any great extent. It is to the Communist Manifesto that we must look for the essential character of the International.

The predominance of his ideas, his own personality, and the centralised organisation, gave Karl Marx a growing and almost dictatorial power in the International. It was this that was responsible, as much as the real difference of aim, for the fight between him and the Anarchist, Michael Bakunin. Not only was there a serious difference of aim, but Marx's autocracy was resented by large sections, especially in the Jura, and Bakunin founded an atheist alliance within the International, which threatened Marx's power severely. Marx was eventually able to expel the Anarchists, but the effort so exhausted the International, already weakened by the fall of the Commune, that it died an obscure death in New York. Marx had removed it there in 1872 to lift it bodily out of the influence of Bakunin, but the step was fatal. New York was too far away.[2]

Such was the society which provided some of the most active members of the Commune. Of the other sections, the most important was the Blanquist. Although in No. 129 we see that Blanqui had outlined an immediate programme, and had also urged action during the war, nevertheless he invariably refused to draw Utopian pictures of the Socialist commonwealth, insisting that the victory of the Revolution was a more important subject of consideration. But he carried this excellent principle so far that his followers found themselves practically without a programme reaching beyond the necessities of the moment, and drifted aimlessly and unhappily, not liking to carry into practice general principles lest their master should not approve and should accuse them of Utopianism. Blanquism without Blanqui was a body without a soul, and the Commune felt this, since it offered to exchange all its hostages—including the Archbishop of Paris, the President of the Haut Cour, and Jecker, the capitalist who inspired Napoleon's Mexican adventure—for Blanqui. Thiers refused, for he knew Blanqui's importance, and his Catholic supporters cared little about the life of a Gallican Archbishop.

[1] See G. Jaeckh: *The International*, first 60 pages.

[2] Bakunin's influence on the Commune seems to have been very small. So I have not considered his movement in detail. In any case, its history has yet to be written; in England there are not even adequate documents available. A good deal can be found in a partisan book (anti-Marxist): J. Guillaume: *L'Internationale*, 4 vols. See, however, pp. 284-5.

The Blanquists, therefore, were reduced to servile imitations of previous revolutions, Committees of Public Safety, etc. This tendency was intensified by the third party traceable in the Commune—headed by Félix Pyat—which, for lack of any other name, we must call the Party of Relics. All the agitators of 1848, largely elderly and exhausted men, had secured election. The schools of '48—Fourierists, Saint Simonians, Cabetists—had long ago vanished: even Proudhon's influence was much less, while Blanc and Ledru-Rollin were respectable Radical Deputies. This merely meant that men who in 1848 had picked up the ideas of this or that school were now devoid of even this guidance, and it is impossible to read, say, Lissagaray's *History of the Commune*, without realising the pernicious influence of these revolutionary "dug-outs." Men who had the prestige of previous persecution, who were dowered with inexhaustible loquacity and even eloquence, but who had no positive programme and only the ordinary stock-in-trade of the professional revolutionist, became the bane of the Commune and gave some excuse for Rossel's remark that the principle of the Commune must be very strong if it could hold out so long in spite of such incompetent leaders.

On the other hand, they certainly adequately represented a large section of the opinion of Paris. Paris had not become Socialist over-night, and the war of the Commune was for many a war to secure the Republic quite as much as one to secure the victory of the proletariat. Such bourgeois Republican bodies as the *Ligue d'Union Républicaine des droits de Paris* had rallied to the Commune purely on these grounds, that it was defending the Republic.[1] We must remember this strain of opinion was very strong when we are inclined to accuse the Commune of being enslaved to the memory of 1793, of Hebertism, and so on.

These differing strands in the composition of the Commune soon became very obvious. The International formed a regular minority, consisting of all its members except Dereure and Chalain, and with the addition of Vallès, Vermorel, Ostyn, Art. Arnould, Tridon, Beslay, Jourde, Verdure and Babick. The differences between it and the majority appear at first sight very small: it objected to the suppression—largely nominal—of some journals, considered some arrests unjustified, etc. None of its Socialist measures were opposed, and it could have carried a whole Utopia of Socialism if it had not realised the folly of passing Socialist decrees when the whole male population was required on the ramparts. Their objection lay to the majority's "Jacobinism," the open and meaningless imitation of 1793 and the failure to provide instruments suited to the times. It was not, moreover, merely the "romanticism" of the majority that offended, it was also the gross and scandalous confusion and incompetence in the departments under their control. The Department of War was, perhaps, the worst. But since they had made the initial mistake of constituting themselves a formal group, the minority was able to do little, and a party spirit arose which thwarted its efforts,

[1] "Vote [for the Commune] . . . and thus save the Republic" (March 25) said its placard. The very name of this organisation gives an accurate description of the motives of many Communards, who cannot properly be called Socialists.

disorganised the Commune itself, and eventually led to a split on May 15 (No. 140).

The various measures of the Commune, which give a certain indication of its character, may be summarised here. It repealed the destructive decree of the Assembly on rents; returned objects pawned by the poor; decreed a maximum salary of £240 for Communard officials; separated Church and State, and secularised education. It also passed the important decrees on the Vendôme column, on abandoned factories and on conscription, which are given in full later (Nos. 131, 134, 135). This was as far as it was able to go in a constructive programme; rightly or wrongly, its members felt it foolish to outline a whole programme of sham decrees when external danger was so pressing. Many, moreover, would have refused to embark on a policy which might have involved the claim to legislate for France.

This refusal to consider general principles led to a serious error. The two manifestoes to the Provinces (Nos. 133, 139) contain little but emotional appeals—a grave mistake—and when the Commune did issue its programme, it produced only the document here numbered 137. Prince Kropotkin (*The Commune of Paris*) claims this as sufficient proof that the Commune was Anarchist and desired the abolition of Government as such, and the autonomy of all communes. This is—in my opinion—untenable.[1] Delescluze was instructed to produce this programme. He did not do so, but left it to one, P. Denis, a sub-editor on Vallès' paper *Le Cri du Peuple*, who was undoubtedly obsessed by the idea of communal autonomy. The Commune, as we have observed, was the product of a revolt of the towns against the country, and in the desire to find a formula to enable themselves to justify their refusal to be forced by an ignorant peasantry into reaction, men were attracted by the phrase "communal autonomy." This was emphasised by the fact that Paris had been the only town to be deprived of all remnants of autonomy by the empire. Each village, said the Central Committee, had some municipal organisation: Paris alone was ruled from the central police headquarters—Paris, whose independent action had been the source of all French freedom. And in 1848 nothing had given so much pleasure as Garnier Pagès' revival of the office of Mayor of Paris. But that the Commune, in fact, had the aim suggested by Kropotkin seems improbable. Denis' statement was passed hurriedly and without discussion, the members being busy with other matters. But it is incredible that these Blanquists and members of the International should all have been philosophical Anarchists without our knowing it, or could seriously have desired full autonomy for the peasant communes, who would instantly have recalled their King and priest. Rather the real aspirations of the Commune were expressed in those newspaper articles in which they outlined the hopes that they had not the time to realise. Particular attention should be given to Millière's thoughtful article (No. 132), to Nostag's somewhat crude voicing of the thought of the International (No. 136) and to Mme. Léo's enunciation of a feminism which had hitherto been

[1] See Lissagaray: *History of the Commune of* 1871, p. 200. Lissagaray was a Communard and his testimony has a personal value.

absent in revolutionary France (No. 138).[1] Not Denis's long and obscure document, but the words of Beslay's speech on opening the sittings of the Commune, were taken as the real programme:

"The Commune will occupy itself with what is local.

"The Department will occupy itself with what is regional.

"The Government will occupy itself with what is national." In any case, we must always remember that the essential feature of the Revolution was not its communal but its proletarian character.

The action of Paris provoked similar action on the part of the great towns of the Provinces: shortlived Communes were proclaimed in Marseilles, Toulouse, Narbonne, St. Etienne, Creusot and Lyons. Even when these had been suppressed and Thiers yielded to the demand for municipal elections, the country had so far recovered from its temporary movement of reaction that the Republicans swept the country. Thiers, alarmed at this evidence of France's disapproval, forbade the meeting of a congress that the new councillors desired to hold.

The Commune remained anxious to keep the peace and to establish some *modus vivendi* with Thiers. Their efforts were frustrated by Thiers' deliberate and wanton bombardment of Paris on April 2. It must be remembered not only that Thiers, "the most eminent figure of the 19th century,"[2] began the civil war, but that he obstinately repulsed all the various attempts which were made at conciliation. His attack on April 2 was answered by a sortie, which, owing to the failure to occupy Mont Valérien, was badly defeated. Henceforward the Commune was reduced to the defensive, while Thiers pressed the attack more vigorously every day. Unfortunately, the Department of War in Paris was in a state of disorganisation. The Central Committee of the Guard was continually interfering and tried to exercise an authority equal to the Commune's. Neither Cluseret, nor his successor Rossel, was capable of discharging his functions properly, and the chaos which they created made vain the brilliant generalship of Dombrowski. The wasted bravery of their troops was remarkable: Porte Maillot, according to all the rules of war untenable, was held till it was in ruins and the forts of Issy and Vanves were held till they were destroyed. As the outlook became gloomier, a Committee of Public Safety was established, and, when it failed, recalled. Later, another was established, but no mechanism could make up for the lack of experience and of firmness in the Communard leaders.[3] On May 15, when Issy at last fell, Delescluze, a civilian, took charge of the Department of War. But it was too late—the whole western side of Paris was untenable. Yet since the Parisian proletariat throughout the struggle did the imposaible, it was not till the night of May 21 that the Versaillese timidly crept in through an

[1] Possibly a trace of Denis' theory may be found in the proclamation of the Central Committee before the elections (May 22) which called upon the city of Paris " to elect her Municipal Assembly which may indifferently be called Communal Assembly or Commune. . . . Reconquer the rights which once every little village had. . . . Paris does not wish to force anyone on the road to the Republic, but is content to advance in it first herself." The terms used, however, are very vague, and it seems unreasonable to read into them a clear-cut political theory.

[2] The Rt. Hon. H. A. L. Fisher, *The Republican Tradition*, p. 240. Also (p. 243). "There was no service which in the pride and energy of his patriotism he was unwilling to render to France."

[3] They even failed to seize the Bank of France and went humbly to solicit loans.

undefended gate (Porte Saint Cloud). Once in, they poured in through five gates, and Thiers even went so low as to secure Prussian permission to use the Porte St. Ouen.[1]

Instantly Paris was covered with barricades and Delescluze issued his last proclamation (No. 141). This was unfortunate in many ways, since the Guards, taking it to mean that affairs were in the hands of the rank and file, went to their own quarters, and all central direction was lost. From the 21st to the 27th the Parisian proletariat withstood Thiers' forces. Each barricade was taken separately with great difficulty and at heavy cost. The Guards seemed to have decided in sober earnest to die rather than surrender, Delescluze himself setting the example.[2] From houses and buildings fired by the Versailles shells, and others burnt by the Commune in its own defence, great tongues of flame arose, and at night Paris seemed one vast conflagration. And inch by inch the Commune was being driven back, hour by hour.

The end came at noon on the 27th. Then came bourgeois mercy and justice. Throughout the combat the Versaillese had shot their prisoners.[3] Now they massacred *en masse*. Inspired by the venomous urging of the Press, the military authorities sanctioned the general massacre by setting up courts which openly defied the canons of civilised warfare and went on the principle of shooting all who could be suspected of having taken any part in the defence of the Commune. The instances given in Marx' pamphlet are not just, being far too moderate. The fable of regiments of *pétroleuses*[4] was invented to excuse the inclusion of women in this holocaust. 20,000 at least[5] perished in this reckless and careless massacre: 100,000 Parisian workers in any case were lost to France through the agency of Thiers. There followed upon this the mockery of trials—since the putrefaction of the heaps of corpses was becoming dangerous to the returning bourgeois and wholesale massacre had to stop. The "justice" there meted out, and the incredible levity with which was ordered death or deportation to the desert island of New Caledonia, perhaps deserve even more condemnation than the previous massacres. Most contemptible of all, however, was the flood of misleading pamphlets and detailed slander of the dead which the bourgeois Press produced, and the open gloating of the upper classes over the wounded, prisoners and dying. It is fortunate, for the honour of the French bourgeoisie, that the very horror of these days prevents our realising their degradation, and that the mind shrinks in loathing from the recital of the deeds of a society which Marx rightly compares to the Rome of Nero.

[1] To fill in this bald recital, reference must be made to No. 142.

[2] When all seemed lost Delescluze, a worn and fragile old man, was seen by friends to walk deliberately down an empty street to an almost undefended barricade. He climbed it, stood on top for a minute, armed only with his cane, was struck by a bullet, turned round and fell dead.

[3] In return for this the Commune shot 63 hostages—a crime, but insignificant compared with the Versailles terror.

[4] Women petrol-throwers, who were supposed to have fired public and other buildings.

[5] Pelletan, *La Semaine de Mai*, pp. 372–398, arrives at the figure of " more than double 17,000."

Bibliographical Note

1. *English Works.*

The only works in English worth consideration are:

P. Lissagaray:—*History of the Commune of* 1871

E. Belfort Bax:—*History of the Paris Commune.*

2. *Bibliographical, etc., Works.*

G. D'Heylli:—*Le Livre Rouge de la Commune.*[1]

A. Schulz:—*Bibliographie de la Commune.*

Firmin Maillard:—*Journaux pendant la siege et la Commune.*

Firmin Maillard:—*Les affiches pendant la Commune.*

3. *Memoirs.*

Maxime Vuillaume:—*Mes Cahiers Rouges au temps de la Commune.* This is perfectly invaluable for the spirit of the Commune and as an antidote to Lissagaray's unrelieved gloom.

Louise Michel:—*La Commune.*

E. Reclus:—*La Commune au jour le jour.*

4. *Hostile Works.*

J. Clère:—*Les Hommes de la Commune.*

C. A. Dauban:—*Le fond de la Société sous la Commune.*

Contain valuable information. The last will serve as a specimen of the bourgeois literature. The official *Enquête sur le* 18 *Mars* may be used, but with caution.

5. Of *General Histories* sufficient are Vol. xi of the *Histoire Socialiste* (by L. Dubreuilh), Edmond Lepelletier's exhaustive *Histoire de la Commune* in 4 vols., and G. Bourgin's short study of the same title.

6. C. Pelletan:—*La Semaine de Mai* is the final and complete study of the Versaillese revenge.

[1] The Decree on p. 134 is a forgery.

Documents

1870 War between France and Prussia.
1870 August 6-9: Three French defeats.
1870 September 4: Republic proclaimed in Paris. Government of National Defence formed.
1870 September 22: Sedan. Defeat and surrender of Napoleon III.
1870 September 25: Paris besieged.

129 "LA PATRIE EN DANGER," No. 50, 9 BRUMAIRE, YEAR 79. (OCTOBER 30, 1870)

1792-1870.

ONLY eighty years between these two dates! The life of an old man. But in his journey from his cradle to his tomb he would have seen the passage of ten ordinary centuries. Nothing remains the same. The moral connexion has vanished. We are of the same race by blood: but not in spirit or in character. The tradition has not left a single trace. And at the two ends of this period are two different standards: 1792, enthusiasm—1870, speculation.

Everywhere we can hear lamentation. Our fathers in 1792 possessed neither the numbers, the riches nor the science of to-day. But they were heroic. They saved the country and crushed the allied monarchs. Are we, with resources they never had, to perish beneath the heel of Prussia before the contemptuous smile of Europe?

And there comes the still more despairing cry "'92! We must be the men of '92 or France will die!" And then this strange refrain: "Rally round the Government of *National Defence*."

Our fathers of '92 rallied round a revolutionary Government which trod underfoot the internal enemy, royalism, and drew the sword against its foreign accomplice, the foreign invader.

And you are rallying round a counter-revolutionary power which proscribes Republicans, courts Royalists and is the humble servant of the invader.

The most energetic venture to say: "We must push it forward, give strength to its weakness and slowness, and yet support it."

Ah! you think the Government is like a parcel which you drag along with you on your journey, because you must have some luggage. Well, it is the luggage which chooses the way and rules the traveller.

Peoples are what their Governments make them. They live and die by them. All their fate is in their hands. It is strange to forget this so soon, after twenty years of Bonaparte.

The Republic of '92 proscribed pitilessly the supporters of monarchy, its military and civil staffs, its laws, its customs, its religion, its ideas and even its costumes. Upright amidst its scattered ruins it led France to ferocious combat and if the Prussian outside advanced too far it did not shrink from a 2nd of November[1] against the Prussian at home.

[1] Of September, probably—*i.e.*, the September massacres. See p. 19.

The Republic of 1870 knows no enemies but Republicans, and is on its knees before the aristocracy and clergy. It pays pensions of 20,000 francs to the millionaire widows of scoundrels who pillaged, sacked, and ruined our country. It hands children to the Jesuits and citizens to militarism. It sacrifices the future to the past and democrats to reactionaries; it paralyses our arms and opposes but the shadow of resistance to the invaders, begs their pardon and implores their goodwill, relies on royalists allied to them and holds over the heads of the revolutionaries the threat of another Saint Bartholomew's day.

Who comes to us and speaks of '92, crying: "Hosannah to the Government of *National Defence*!" They are the two antipodes: '92 saved the Revolution and founded the Republic, the Hôtel de Ville is destroying it.

Its auxiliaries are all the monarchists who bawl: "*Vive la République!*" after they have destroyed and proscribed it for twenty years, while preparing to destroy and proscribe it even more furiously.

It is the standard of traitors and chameleons, of amphibious creatures who have a foot in every anti-chamber, an article of every colour and a stepping-stone to every building. All these corrupt hearts fly to its shadow and act as escort and chorus to its deceptions.

It is the counter revolution. It is digging the grave of France.

BLANQUI.

1870 October 31: News of Bazaine's surrender of Metz.
1870 October 31: Revolt in Paris oversets the Government for a day.
1871 January 22: Moderates force removal of Trochu.
1871 January 27: J. Favre negotiates an armistice.
1871 February 8: Assembly elected. Monarchist majority.
1871 February 24: Central Committee of the National Guard elected.
1871 March 3: The National Guard refuses to recognise d'Aurelles de Paladine (Bonapartist General), Thiers' nominee for their head.
1871 March 10: Assembly makes Versailles the capital.
1871 March 13: Decree on rents and bills.
1871 March 18: Thiers sends soldiers to seize the cannon of the National Guard. They fail, and the Government flees.

130 MANIFESTO OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Paris, March 20th.

REPUBLICAN FEDERATION
of the
NATIONAL GUARD.

IF the Central Committee of the National Guard had been a Government, it could have disdained to justify itself, out of consideration for the dignity of its electors. But since its first pronouncement was to declare that it had no pretensions to replace those whom the people's wrath has

blown away," and since it regards it as a matter of common decency to remain scrupulously within the express limits of its mandate, it remains merely a collection of individuals who have a right to defend themselves.

The child of the Republic which writes as its motto that great word "Fraternity," it pardons its detractors, but would use persuasion with honest men who have accepted their slanders through ignorance.

It has not been a secret organisation: its members have signed all its proclamations. If their name were obscure, yet they have not shirked a responsibility which was only too great.

It has not been an obscure organisation, for it is the free expression of the votes of two hundred and fifteen battalions of the National Guard.

It has not been the fomenter of disorder, for the National Guard, which has done it the honour of accepting its leadership, has committed no excesses or reprisals, and has made itself commanding and strong by its wisdom and moderation.

And yet provocation has not been wanting; and yet the Government has not ceased from using the most scandalous expedients to force a resort to that most shocking crime, civil war.

It has slandered Paris and roused the provinces against her.

It has led against us our brothers of the army who have died of cold in our squares when their hearth-fires were awaiting them.

It desired to impose a general-in-chief upon you.

By a night attack it attempted to deprive us of our artillery after we had prevented it handing it over to the Prussians.

Finally, with the assistance of its panic-stricken allies of Bordeaux,[1] it said to Paris: "You have shown yourself heroic: well, we are afraid of you and will seize from you your crown which you hold as the Capital."

What did the Central Committee do in reply to these attacks? It founded the Federation; it preached moderation and—we will say it—generosity; at the moment when the armed attack was beginning, it was saying to all: "No aggression, and strike back only in the last extremity!"

It called to it the aid of every intelligence and every talent; it solicited the assistance of the *corps des officiers* [*commissioned officers*], it opened its door to all who knocked in the name of the Republic.

Then on which side was right and justice? On which side was bad faith?

This story is so short and near to us that all must remember it. If we write it down to-day, on the eve of our retirement, it is, we repeat, purely for the benefit of honest men, who have thoughtlessly accepted slanders worthy of their authors alone.

One of the great reasons of the wrath of these latter is the obscurity of our names. Alas! there are many names which are famous, too famous, and their notoriety has been our ruin. . . .

Would you know one of the latest means they have used against us? They are refusing bread to the troops, who chose to be disarmed rather than fire

[1] Where the Assembly first sat.

on the people. And they call us murderers, they who punish with starvation refusal to murder!

First, we declare indignantly that the mud and blood with which they try to stain our honour is ignoble and infamous. No order for execution has been signed by us; the National Guard has taken part in no crime.

What interest could it have in so doing? What interest could we have?

It is as silly as it is infamous.

Indeed it is almost shameful to defend ourselves. Our conduct shows our character definitely. Have we cadged salaries or honours? If we are unknown and yet have been able to secure the confidence of 215 battalions, was it not because we disdained propaganda on our own behalf? Notoriety is cheap: a few empty words or a little cowardice will secure it, as quite recent events have shown.

With a mandate that laid a heavy responsibility on our shoulders, we fulfilled our duty without hesitation or fear, and now that we have achieved our aim we say to the people, who respected us enough to listen to our advice, although we frequently checked their impatience: "Here is the mandate you gave us. Our duty ends where our personal interest begins. Do your will: you, our master, are free. Obscure but a few days ago, we shall once again seek obscurity in your ranks, and prove to the governing classes that it is possible to go down the steps of your Hôtel de Ville with head upright, certain of finding at the foot the clasp of your strong and loyal hand."

The Members of the Central Committee:—

ANT. ARNAUD, ASSI, BILLIORAY, FERRAT, BABICK, ED. MOREAU, C. DUPONT, VARLIN, BOURSIER, MORTIER, GOUHIER, LAVALLETTE, FR. JOURDE, ROUSSEAU, CH. LULLIER, HENRY FORTUNÉ, G. ARNOLD, VIARD, BLANCHET, J. GROLLARD, BARROUD, H. GERESME, FABRE, POUGERET, BOUIT.

1871 March 22: Riot in the Place Vendôme.
1871 March 23-28: Rise and fall of Communes at Creusot, St. Etienne and Lyons.
1871 March 23-April 5: Marseilles Commune.
1871 March 24-31: Narbonne Commune.
1871 March 26: Elections in Paris with consent of the Mayors.
1871 March 28: Proclamation of the Commune.

131 FIRST PROCLAMATIONS OF THE COMMUNE

COMMUNE OF PARIS.

CITIZENS,

YOUR Commune is inaugurated.

The vote of March 26th has sanctioned the victorious Revolution. A cowardly aggressor had seized you by the throat: in legitimate

self-defence you expelled from your walls the government which desired to dishonour you by imposing on you a King.

To-day, the criminals you did not even trouble to pursue, have taken advantage of your magnanimity to organise a monarchic conspiracy at the very gates of the city. They invoke civil war: they use all means of corruption; they admit all allies; they have even gone begging for foreign aid.

From these execrable devices we appeal to France and the whole world.

CITIZENS,

You have just given yourselves a constitution which defies all attack.

You are masters of your fate. Strong in your support, your representatives will repair the destruction caused by the fallen authorities—industry in danger, labour in suspense and paralysed commerce, will all receive vigorous stimulus.

To-day, the expected decision concerning rent;[1]

To-morrow, concerning the moratorium;

All public services re-organised and simplified;

The National Guard, henceforward the sole armed force in the city, re-organised without delay;

Such will be our first measures.

The people's representatives only ask the support of its confidence to assure the triumph of the Republic.

Hôtel de Ville. 29th March, 1871. *The Commune of Paris.*

The Commune of Paris decrees:

(1) Conscription is abolished.

(2) No military force except the National Guard can be created or introduced into Paris.

(3) All fit citizens form part of the National Guard.

Hôtel de Ville. 29th March, 1871. *The Commune of Paris.*

1871 April 2: Thiers attacks and shells Paris.

1871 April 3: Parisian attack on Versailles repulsed.

132 J. B. MILLIÈRE: "THE REVOLUTION OF 1871."

"La Commune," No. 15,[2] Monday, April 3, 14th Germinal, Year 79.

THE REVOLUTION OF 1871.

REVOLUTIONS never reproduce themselves in exactly the same manner. This is the reason of their success, since reactionary governments are forearmed by experience against the return of events which have overset their predecessors, but cannot foresee the accidental causes which provoke a new explosion of the public conscience.

[1] Rents for the quarters ending October, 1870, January, 1871, April, 1871, were remitted, and any payments made already were to count for the next quarter.

[2] Edited by the staff of the *Combat* and *Vengeur*, Félix Pyat's papers. Eventually it became the organ almost exclusively of the personal opinion of J. B. Millière. It was suppressed on May 20, as a result of a fierce campaign by Georges Duchêne against the incompetence in high places. Although it was not unjustified, Duchêne certainly went too far in saying that if the Commune's officers had not resigned by May 20 it would be a patriotic duty to assassinate them.

But at bottom all revolutions shew the same social phenomenon. They are successive evolutions of humanity. Each is a fresh phase of progress; and they are invariably provoked by the aggression of authority constituted outside and over the heads of the people, by the violence of monarchic and aristocratic governments dominating the nation.

More than any other has the present Revolution a defensive character. Whatever slanderers may say, Paris to-day is not in insurrection, she is only resisting attacks on her liberties by a power that is frankly hostile to the legal established form of Government—the Republic. Paris is acting in legitimate self-defence; she has not, as has been said, stepped outside the limits of legality to enter those of right, she is maintaining her rights through republican legality, and the insurgents are those who for nearly two months have incessantly provoked her, defied her, covered her with insults, attacked her by force and are still threatening to strangle her amidst the horrors of civil war.

To gain an exact idea of the present situation and of the character and meaning of the revolutionary phase upon which we are entering, we consider rapidly those which have preceded it.

After a preparatory toil of several centuries the Third Estate in 1789 achieved a revolution whose effect was to destroy the political régime founded on the privileges of the nobility and to substitute another founded on the privileges of capital.

This was the coming of the bourgeoisie.

This class absorbed the relics of the nobility, to-day completely merged with it, but, having used it as an instrument, it then repulsed the proletariat. It excluded labour from the social commonwealth—labour, that is, without its necessary instrument, capital.

Of the three classes then existing, the Revolution of 1789 suppressed one, the nobility, and left the other two in existence, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

It was the logical consequence of the principle of individualism the basis of the bourgeois oligarchy. It introduced liberty into our economic laws while excluding her twin sister Equality It sanctified what is called the right of the stronger: it denied human solidarity and raised egoism to the level of a social institution.

The effects of such a régime were soon obvious. It had taken three centuries to prepare the success of the bourgeoisie: through the abuse of its exclusive principle one century has sufficed for its historical evolution and to-day its decay is as profound as that of the nobility in 1789.

Let there be no mistake. All the successive governments in France since the Revolution have merely been the reign of the bourgeois aristocracy. Each has given predominance to certain particular tendencies: under the First Empire, to the military spirit: under the Restoration to aristocratic pretensions: under Louis Philippe, to the spirit of greed: the Second Empire united all these decrepit ambitions: but at the bottom of all these governments was

English constitutionalism and whenever the Opposition triumphed—as in 1848 by the victory of the people and in 1870 by the victory of the foreigner—its only aim was to revive the constitution of 1791, replacing the King by a President—the whole to be crowned by clericalism, the keystone of this anti-social building.

For eight months its results have been before our eyes. We have observed one of those cataclysms which but rarely occur in history. It is the dissolution of all parts of the social body: the decomposition of its elements. The governing classes are putrefying, and French civilisation is for ever lost if it any longer remains in the hands of this rotting oligarchy.

Who can save us?

The proletariat.

Just as eighty years ago the capitalist system took the place of the feudal régime, so to-day must labour absorb capital. By labour we understand all forms of labour, agricultural, industrial, scientific, artistic and commercial.

The two former classes, the Nobles and the Third Estate, have united to form the bourgeoisie, in its turn the bourgeoisie must be fused with the proletariat and form but one class, the proletariat.

That will be the distinctive character of the Revolution that we are beginning.

Is the French proletariat capable of effecting this regeneration to-day?

In Paris and some other great towns, yes, the proletariat is sufficiently prepared to attempt it successfully; but in most small towns and particularly in the villages it is as yet incapable of it.

There lies the great danger of the Communal Revolution which has begun in Paris.

If this Revolution, fated to regenerate the world, was effective all over France, then it could proceed from the bottom upwards: but if at the present time each commune is given the power to organise itself in the way it pleases, instead of continuing the work of civilisation it will destroy it; instead of advancing French society will fall back into the night of the Middle Ages and we shall perceive a reaction far more appalling than that which was shewn by the election of the rural majority of the Assembly.

Hence the difficulties of the Communal Council. We have to face the question of the organisation of the Commune under the most unfavourable conditions possible, which make a good solution unattainable. Influenced by political preoccupations and the Government's enmity to Paris men's minds are not disposed to establish justly the principles of natural right which should regulate the relations of the Commune, a social unit, and the Nation, a political unit; and by the mere force of circumstances the Communal Council has to have unwilling recourse to measures which in ordinary times would be outside its sphere of action.

Whatever be the attitude of the Paris Commune, it is obliged to take exceptional measures to resist the attacks of the political power. Its legal right is not recognised by the Government; its very existence is threatened; it is

in a state of war; its every action is a battle and like the Republic of 1792 its task is to fight rather than administrate.

In such a conflict it could not be demanded that the Commune should enfold itself in a strict legality which for it would mean death. To avoid the dangers that civil war brings to all, one of two results must as quickly as possible be attained.

Either the Versaillese Government must be induced to recognise and sanction by law the rights of the Commune.

Or the antagonism must be stopped by the substitution for the present Assembly, whose particular mandate has practically expired,[1] of a Constituent Assembly whose mission will be to establish the bases of political and administrative organisation in France on strong republican and municipal institutions.

MILLIÈRE,

Representative of the Seine.

1871 April 4: Communard revolt at Limoges.
1871 April 4 onwards: Continual war on the west side of Paris.

133 PROCLAMATION TO THE DEPARTMENTS

FRENCH REPUBLIC

Liberty—Equality—Fraternity.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS.

To the Departments.

Citizens,

YOU desire to know the truth. Up till now the Versaillese Government has only fed you on lies and slanders! Therefore we will enlighten you upon the exact situation.

It was the Versaillese Government which commenced civil war by the murder of our advanced posts, who were deceived by the peaceful appearance of its assassins. It is the government of Versailles also that murders our prisoners and threatens Paris with the horrors of famine and siege, careless of the interests and sufferings of a population already tried by five months' investment. We say nothing of the interruption of the postal service,[2] so destructive to commerce, of the embezzlement of *octrois*, etc., etc. Our thoughts are chiefly occupied by the infamous propaganda organised by the Versaillese Government in the Departments to blacken the sublime movement of the Parisian people. You are deceived, Brothers, by stories that

[1] With the conclusion of peace with Germany.

[2] The delegate of the Commune to the Post Office, Theisz, made an amicable arrangement with the Versaillese official, by which the departure of the head should be facilitated and all papers, etc., left in order. Instead of this, the official reduced the Post Office to chaos, dismissed the staff to Versailles, and removed everything, including the stamps. In addition to this, Thiers cut off Paris from all communication with the Departments and prevented any official or other message being published, while reserving full liberty for his own propaganda, which was of a mendacity unusual even for a politician. These facts explain the prominence given to what seems to be a minor and almost ludicrous grievance.

Paris wishes to govern France and exercises a dictatorship in defiance of national sovereignty: you are deceived by stories of open robbery and murder in Paris. Never before have our streets been so quiet: during five weeks, no theft has been committed, no murder attempted.

Paris hopes only to found the Republic and acquire her communal freedom and is happy to give an example to the other communes of France.

If the Commune of Paris has exceeded the limits of its normal powers, it has done so with the deepest distress and only in order to reply to the state of war produced by the Government of Versailles. Paris hopes only to confine herself within her own autonomy and has the greatest respect for the equal rights of the other communes of France.

As for the members of the Commune, their only ambition is to see the arrival of the day when Paris, freed from the Royalist menace, can proceed to fresh elections.

Once more, Brothers, do not be inveigled by the monstrous inventions of the Royalists of Versailles. Remember that it is as much for you as for herself that Paris struggles and fights to-day. Join your efforts to ours and we shall win, for we represent right and justice, that is, the happiness of all through all, liberty for each and all beneath the auspices of a voluntary and fruitful solidarity.

Paris, April 6th, 1871.

The Executive Commission,
COURNET, DELESCLUZE, FÉLIX PYAT, TRIDON, VAILLANT, VERMOREL.

134 DECREE ON THE VENDÔME COLUMN[1]

Paris, April 12th, 1871.

The Commune of Paris,

CONSIDERING that the imperial Column *of the Place Vendôme*[2] is a monument of savagery,[3] a symbol of brute force and false glory, an affirmation of militarism, a negation of international law, an abiding insult of the conquerors to the vanquished, a perpetual attack upon one of the three great principles of the French Republic—fraternity;

DECREES.

Article First.

The Column of the Place Vendôme shall be demolished.[4]

Paris, April 12th, 1871.[5]

[1] According to the original *arrêté*, which is much altered.
[2] Added later.
[3] This read originally " a pagan and savage monument."
[4] A correction of another word which was apparently " abolished."
[5] *Sic*. There follows—struck out— the beginning of another Article which seems to have had little relation to the Column: " The elections to .....(?) will take place next Sunday."

135 DECREE ON CO-OPERATIVE WORKSHOPS

The Commune of Paris,

CONSIDERING that many factories have been abandoned by their directors in order to escape the performance of civic duties, ignoring the interests of their workers;

Considering that, as a result of this cowardly desertion many industries essential to the life of society are held up and the livelihood of the workers endangered.

DECREES:

The trade councils[1] of the workers are convoked to establish a commission of Inquiry, whose aims shall be:

(1) To furnish statistics of the number of workshops abandoned, and an exact inventory of their present state and that of the instruments they contain.

(2) To present a report on the practical means of exploiting again at once these deserted shops, not by the renegades who have left them, but by a co-operative association of the workers once employed therein.

(3) To elaborate a constitution for such co-operative workers' societies.

(4) To constitute a jury of arbitration which shall pronounce, at the return of the said employers, upon the conditions of the final cession of the workshops to the workers' societies, and upon the amount of the indemnity the societies shall pay the employers.

This Commission of Inquiry must address its report to the Communal Commission on Labour and Exchange, which will be required to present to the Commune with as brief delay as possible, the draft of a decree in the interests of the workers and the Commune.

Paris, April 16th, 1871.

1871 April 16: Thiers repulses the last offer of mediation (Freemasons).

136 JULES NOSTAG: "COUNTRY—HUMANITY."

"LA RÉVOLUTION POLITIQUE ET SOCIALE," No. 3, APRIL 16, 27TH GERMINAL (ORGAN OF THE INTERNATIONAL-UNITED SECTIONS OF IVRY STATION AND BERCY)[2]

COUNTRY—HUMANITY.

"OUR country"—a word, an error! "Humanity"—a fact, a truth! Invented by priests and kings, like the myth God "the country" has only been used to confine human animals in exact limits, where they can be shaved and bled for their masters' benefit, under their eyes and in the name of their unclean fetish.

[1] "Chambres syndicales." Two meetings were held.

[2] Distinguish from this *La Révolution*, a daily of a violent tone, edited by one Marin—this is a weekly—and also a journal of the same title as this (specimen number only mentioned by Maillard and extant in the British Museum) edited by J. J. Danduran, a journalist of '48.

When the worm-eaten wood of the throne began to crack and looked like collapsing, the shepherd, or rather the butcher of his people made an arrangement with his dear brother or cousin over the way, and the two crowned wretches flung against each other stupid crowds who—infatuate mobs—slew each other and cheered for glory and their country while their masters chuckled in their beards.

After the bloodletting Cæsar, who kept the score, called off the slaughter, embraced his dear brother the enemy and drove back to its fold his decimated flock, incapable for months of annoying him at all.

The trick had succeeded.

To-day we have had enough. Peoples are brothers. Kings and their valets are the only enemies.

Enough of blood and folly. Peoples, your "countries" are but names. France is dead, humanity remains.

Let us be men and prove it!

The Utopia of Anorchasis (*sic*) Clootz becomes true. Nationality—an error and but the chance of birth—is an evil. We will destroy it.

Birth here or there, a mere accident, changes our nationality and makes us friends or enemies. Let us reject this silly lottery—a farce in which we have always been the butts.

Let "country" become an empty word—a valueless administrative division—our country is wherever life is free and work is done.

Peoples, workers, light is arising: let our blindness end. Down with tyrants and despots!

France is dead, long live Humanity!

JULES NOSTAG.

137 PROGRAMME OF THE COMMUNE

FRENCH REPUBLIC

LIBERTY—EQUALITY—FRATERNITY.

Commune of Paris.

IN the sad and terrible conflict which again threatens Paris with the horrors of siege and bombardment, which sheds French blood and spares neither our brothers, our wives nor our children struck down by shells and grapeshot, it is essential that public opinion should not be divided and the national conscience should be untroubled.

Paris and the whole country must know the nature, reason and aim of the present revolution; it is just, finally, that the responsibility for our mourning, suffering and misfortunes should accrue to those who betrayed France and handed Paris over to the foreigner and now with blind and cruel obstinacy are seeking to destroy the great city and bury in the fall of freedom and the Republic the double evidence of their treason and their crime.

It is the duty of the Commune to affirm and define the hopes and desires of the people of Paris, to determine the character of the movement of March

18th, which has been misunderstood and slandered by the politicians at Versailles.

Once again Paris labours and suffers for all France whose intellectual moral, administrative and economic revival, whose glory and prosperity are prepared by Parisian struggles and sacrifices.

What does she wish?

The recognition and consolidation of the Republic, the only form of Government compatible with popular rights and the free and regular development of society.

Absolute autonomy of the Commune extended to all parts of France and assuring to everyone integrity of rights, and to all Frenchmen the full exercise of their abilities as men, citizens and producers.

The autonomy of the Commune will have as only limit the right of autonomy, equally valid for all other Communes who adhere to the contract of association which will secure French Unity.

The inherent rights of a commune are:

Vote of a communal budget of receipts and expenditure: fixing and distribution of taxation: direction of local services: organisation of the magistracy, internal police and education: administration of communal property.

Selection of magistrates and communal officials of all grades by election or competition, with responsibility and the permanent right of control and recall.

The absolute guarantee of individual liberty and liberty of conscience.

Permanent intervention of the citizens in their communal affairs by the free manifestation of their ideas, and free defence of their interests: guarantees given to such manifestations by the Commune which alone is charged to supervise and secure the free and just exercise of the right of meeting and publicity.

Organisation of urban defence and of the National Guard, which elects its chiefs and alone maintains order in the city.

Paris desires no more local guarantees than these, if, of course, she finds in the great central administration, the delegates of the federated communes, the realisation and practice of the same principles.

But to favour her autonomy, and profiting by her liberty of action, she reserves to herself the right to carry out at home as pleases her the administrative and economic reforms that her population demands, to create institutions to develop and spread education, production, exchange and credit, to universalise power and property in accordance with the needs of the moment, the wishes of those interested and the results of experience.

Our enemies are deceived, or deceive the country when they accuse Paris of desiring to impose her will and supremacy on the rest of the nation and acquire a dictatorship which would be a serious attack on the independence and sovereignty of the other communes.

They are deceived, or deceive the country, when they accuse Paris of aiming at the destruction of the French Unity accomplished by the Revolu-

tion and acclaimed by our fathers at the festival of the federation of all the parts of old France.

Unity, as imposed on us till now by empire, monarchy and parliamentarism, is only despotic, stupid, arbitrary or burdensome centralisation.

Political Unity, as Paris desires it, is the voluntary association of all local initiatives, spontaneous and free co-operation of all individual energies to a common end—the well-being, liberty and security of all.

The communal revolution begun by the popular initiative of March 18th inaugurates a new era of experimental positive and scientific politics.

It is the end of the old governmental and clerical world, the world of militarism, officialdom, exploitation, speculation, monopolies and privileges which have brought slavery to the proletariat and unhappiness and disaster to the Country.

Let our beloved and great Country, deceived by lies and slanders, be reassured!—The struggle between Paris and Versailles is one of those which cannot end in an illusory compromise; its issue cannot be in doubt. Victory, sought by the National Guard with untiring energy, will be on the side of idealism and right.

We appeal to France.

Knowing that Paris in arms is as calm as she is brave, that she supports order with as much energy as enthusiasm; that devotion has armed her for the liberty and glory, let France stop this bloody conflict.

France must disarm Versailles by the solemn expression of her irresistible will.

Since she will be benefited by our conquests, let her declare her sympathy with our efforts: let her be our ally in a conflict which can only end in the triumph of the communal idea or in the ruin of Paris.

For ourselves, citizens of Paris, our mission is to accomplish the modern Revolution, the greatest and most fruitful of all that have illumined history.

Our duty is to fight and win.

April 19th, 1871.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS.

1871 May 1: Fort Issy in serious danger First Committee of Public Safety. Rossel Delegate for War.

138 MME. ANDRÉ LEO: REVOLUTION WITHOUT WOMEN

(FROM "LA SOCIALE," No. 39, MAY 8TH, 1871—18 FLOREAL, YEAR 79.)

* * * However, we must argue a little. Can the revolution be made without women? For eighty years they have been trying to do so and have not yet succeeded.

The first revolution gave women the title of citizens but not the rights. It left them deprived of liberty and equality.

Repulsed by the Revolution, women fell back upon Catholicism and under

its influence made up that great reactionary force, imbued with the spirit of the Past, which strangles each Revolution at its birth.

When will it be realized that this has gone on long enough? When will the intelligence of republicans be able to comprehend their principles and serve their own interests?

They demand that the women should no longer be under the yoke of the priest, and they are displeased when women are freethinkers. They are willing woman should not act against them, but reject her assistance.

Why?

I can tell you.

Because many republicans—I do not mean the true republicans—have only dethroned Emperor and God to take their place themselves.

And naturally to satisfy this desire they must have subjects, male or female. Woman must no longer obey the priest; but she must not be independent either, any more than before. She must be neutral and passive, under the man's direction: she has only changed her confessor.

Well, this arrangement has no chance.

On this point God has an immense advantage over a man. He remains unknown: that is why he can be the ideal.

Again. Religion condemns reason and forbids science. That is simple, radical and clear: a circle which one does not come out of, once one is in, except by breaking it.

But the Revolution, the new spirit, exists only by the exercise of reason and liberty and the search for truth and justice in all things. This is not a circle, but a straight line prolonged to infinity.

Where can this way end? What limit can be placed to the advance of this spirit or that? Who has the right to place it?

The Revolution means—since we must take its side—liberty and responsibility for every human being, with common rights as their only limit and without any privilege of race or sex.

Women will not abandon their old faith except to embrace the new with enthusiasm. They will not and cannot be neutral. The choice lies between their hostility and their devotion. Some, no doubt, despising obstacles, strong and convinced will persist in spite of their humiliations. But such natures are rare. Most human beings are impressed chiefly by facts and discouraged by injustice.

Now, who suffers most from the present crisis, the dearness of food and the cessation of labour? The woman, particularly the isolated woman whom the new regime takes no more care of than the old.

Who has least to gain—immediately, at any rate—from the success of the Revolution? Again, the woman. It is man's enfranchisement, not hers, that they are fighting for.

And when, moved by the sublime impulse which attracts us all now to

liberty, she yet offers her aid to this forgetful Republic, she is thrust back with contemptuous insolence! . . . . . [1]

From one point of view the history of France since '89 could well be written as the *History of the Inconsequences of the Revolutionary Party*. The woman question would take up the longest chapter, and in it we should read how this Party managed to hand over to the enemy half of its troops, who asked no more than to be allowed to march and fight in its ranks.

ANDRÉ LEO.

1871 May 9: Issy evacuated. Rossel dismissed. Delescluze takes his place.

1871 May 13: Final fall of Issy.

139 OFFICIAL MANIFESTO TO THE GREAT TOWNS (May 15th).

AFTER two months of incessant battle Paris is untired and undamaged.

Paris fights always, knowing neither truce nor rest, untiring—heroic—unconquered.

Paris has treated with Death. Behind her forts are her walls: behind her walls are her barricades: behind her barricades are her houses which will have to be wrenched from her one by one, which in case of need she will blow up rather than surrender at discretion.

Great towns of France will you watch unmoved impassively this mortal struggle between the Past and the Future, between the Republic and the Monarchy?

Or will you see at last that Paris is the champion of France and the world, that to fail to aid her is to betray her? . . . .

You desire the Republic or your votes are nonsensical; you desire the Commune, for to refuse it would be to abdicate your part in the national sovereignty; you desire political liberty and social equality, since you inscribe them on your programmes; you see clearly that the army of Versailles is the army of Bonapartism, of monarchic centralisation, of despotism and privilege, for you know its leaders and recall their record.

For what do you wait before you rise? For what do you wait before you expel from among you the miserable agents of the government of shame and surrender, which barters and buys from the Prussian army at this very moment the means of bombarding Paris from all sides?

Will you wait till the last defender of right has fallen beneath the poisoned bullets of Versailles?

Will you wait until Paris is a cemetery and each house a tomb?

Great towns, you have sent us your fraternal adhesion: you have said: "Our hearts are with you."

[1] General Dombrowski had just refused the aid of a battalion of women soldiers.

Great towns, the time of manifestoes is passed: acts are needed when the cannon speaks.

Enough of platonic sympathy. You have rifles and munitions: To Arms! Rise, towns of France!

Paris looks to you: Paris waits for your lines to encircle the cowards who shell her and to prevent their escape from the punishment that awaits them.

Paris does, and will do, her duty to the end.

But remember, Lyons, Marseilles, Lille, Toulouse, Nantes, Bordeaux and the rest . . . . .

If Paris fall for the liberty of the world, the vengeance of history will be able to say that you slew her, since you permitted the murder.

The delegate of the Commune for Foreign Relations.

PASCHAL GROUSSET.

1871 May 15: Second Committee of Public Safety.

140 DECLARATION OF THE MINORITY ON MAY 15

BY a special and express vote the Commune of Paris has abdicated its power into the hands of a dictator, to whom it has given the name of the Committee of Public Safety.

By its own vote the majority of the Commune has denied its responsibility and left all responsibility for our situation in the hands of this Committee.

The minority to which we belong affirms on the other hand the idea that it is the duty of the Commune to the political and social revolutionary movement to accept all responsibility and decline none, however worthy the hands to which it desires to entrust them.

For ourselves, like the majority, we desire the accomplishment of political and social renovation; but, unlike it, we demand in the name of our electorate the right to be answerable ourselves to our electors for our actions and will not hide behind a dictatorship which our mandate will not permit us to recognize.

Henceforward, therefore, we will only be present at the Assembly when it constitutes itself a court of justice to judge one of its members.

Devoted to our great communal cause for which so many citizens each day give up their lives, we shall retire to our *arrondissements* which have been perhaps too much neglected.

Since we are moreover convinced that the war now takes precedence of all other questions, we shall spend what time our municipal duties leave us in the midst of our brothers of the National Guard and will take our part in this decisive struggle fought in the name of the rights of the people.

There, too, can we usefully serve our principles and avoid creating in the Commune dissensions which we should all regret. For we are convinced

that, majority or minority, in spite of political differences, we all pursue the same end.

Political liberty,
Emancipation of the worker.
Vive la République Sociale! Vive la Commune!

Signed: CH. BESLAY, JOURDE, THEISZ, LEFRANÇAIS, EUGENE GIRARDIN, VERMOREL, CLÉMENCE, ANDRIEUX, SERAILLER, CH. LONGUET, ARTHUR ARNAULD, VICTOR CLÉMENT, AVRIAL, OSTYN, FRANKEL, PINDY, ARNOLD, JULES VALLÈS, TRIDON, VARLIN, GUSTAVE COURBET.

1871 May 16: Fall of the Vendôme Column.
1871 May 16: Assembly refuses to recognise the Republic.
1871 May 21: Versaillese surprise Porte Saint Cloud.
1871 May 22: Versaillese enter by five gates.

141 LAST PROCLAMATION

2 Prairial—22nd May.

TO THE PEOPLE OF PARIS,
TO THE NATIONAL GUARD,

Citizens,

ENOUGH of militarism! No more staff-officers, decorated with gold lace all over their uniforms! Room for the people, the fighters, the bare arms! The hour of revolutionary war has sounded.

The people knows nothing of clever manœuvring, but with a rifle in its hands and the pavement beneath its feet it fears none of the strategy of the Royalist schools

To arms, citizens, to arms! You know that we must win or fall into the merciless hands of the reactionaries and clericals at Versailles, of these wretches who deliberately delivered France to the Prussians and make us pay the price of their treason.

If you desire the blood that has been spilt like water for six weeks to be fruitful, if you would live free in free and equal France and save your children from your sorrows and misery, you will rise as one man, and at your formidable resistance, the enemy who hopes to enslave you, will be left only with the shame and stain of his useless crimes during the last two months.

Citizens, your representatives will fight and die with you if need be: but in the name of our glorious France, mother of all popular revolutions, unchanging home of the ideas of justice and solidarity which must and will be

the laws of the world, march against the enemy, let your revolutionary energy shew him that he can sell Paris, but cannot surrender it or conquer it.[1]

The Civil Delegate for War.

CH. DELESCLUZE.

1871 May 22-27: Battle in the streets of Paris. Sixty-three hostages shot.
1871 May 26-June 2: Continual massacres.
1871–1877: Judicial murders, etc.

142 THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE[2]

ADDRESS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL
OF THE
INTERNATIONAL
WORKING-MEN'S ASSOCIATION

TO ALL THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION IN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES.

I.

ON the 4th of September, 1870, when the working men of Paris proclaimed the Republic, which was almost instantaneously acclaimed throughout France, without a single voice of dissent, a cabal of place-hunting barristers, with Thiers for their statesman and Trochu for their general, took hold of the Hotel de Ville. At that time they were imbued with so fanatical a faith in the mission of Paris to represent France in all epochs of historical crisis, that, to legitimatise their usurped titles as Governors of France, they thought it quite sufficient to produce their lapsed mandates as representatives of Paris. In our second address on the late war, five days after the rise of these men, we told you who they were. Yet, in the turmoil of surprise, with the real leaders of the working class still shut up in Bonapartist prisons and the Prussians already marching upon Paris, Paris bore with their assumption of power, on the express condition that it was to be wielded for the single purpose of national defence. Paris, however, was not to be defended without arming its working class, organising them into an effective force, and training their ranks by the war itself. But Paris armed was the Revolution armed. A victory of Paris over the Prussian aggressor would have been a victory of the French workman over the French capitalist and his State parasites. In this conflict between national duty and class interest, the Government of National Defence did not hesitate one moment to turn into a Government of National Defection.

The first step they took was to send Thiers on a roving tour to all the Courts of Europe there to beg mediation by offering the barter of the Republic

[1] *Le Salut Publique* (G. Maroteau) prints a different version, which adds here the sentences "The Commune relies on you. Rely upon the Commune," and after Delescluze's signature the words "Committee of Public Safety." Certain of the published placards do the same.

[2] Written by Karl Marx.

for a king. Four months after the commencement of the siege, when they thought the opportune moment come for breaking the first word of capitulation, Trochu, in the presence of Jules Favre and others of his colleagues, addressed the assembled mayors of Paris in these terms:—

"The first question put to me by my colleagues on the very evening of the 4th of September was this: Paris, can it, with any chance of success stand a siege by the Prussian army? I did not hesitate to answer in the negative. Some of my colleagues here present will warrant the truth of my words and the persistence of my opinion. I told them, in these very terms, that, under the existing state of things, the attempt of Paris to hold out a siege by the Prussian army would be a folly. Without doubt, I added, it would be an heroic folly; but that would be all . . . . The events (managed by himself) have not given the lie to my prevision." This nice little speech of Trochu was afterwards published by M. Corbon, one of the mayors present.

Thus, on the very evening of the proclamation of the Republic, Trochu's "plan" was known to his colleagues to be the capitulation of Paris. If national defence had been more than a pretext for the personal government of Thiers, Favre and Co., the upstarts of the 4th of September would have abdicated on the 5th—would have initiated the Paris people into Trochu's "plan,"[1] and called upon them to surrender at once, or to take their own fate into their own hands. Instead of this, the infamous impostors resolved upon curing the heroic folly of Paris by a regimen of famine and broken heads, and to dupe her in the meanwhile by ranting manifestoes, holding forth that Trochu, "the Governor of Paris, will never capitulate," and Jules Favre, the Foreign Minister, will "not cede an inch of our territory, nor a stone of our fortresses." In a letter to Gambetta, that very same Jules Favre avows that what they were "defending" against were not the Prussian soldiers, but the working men of Paris. During the whole continuance of the siege the Bonapartist cut-throats, whom Trochu had wisely intrusted with the command of the Paris army, exchanged, in their intimate correspondence, ribald jokes at the well-understood mockery of defence (see, for instance, the correspondence of Alphonse Simon Guiod, supreme commander of the artillery of the Army of Defence of Paris and Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor, to Suzanne, general of division of artillery, a correspondence published by the *Journal officiel* of the Commune). The mask of imposture was at last dropped on the 28th of January, 1871. With the true heroism of utter self-debasement, the Government of National Defence, in their capitulation, came out as the Government of France by Bismarck's permission—a part so base that Louis Bonaparte himself had, at Sedan, shrunk from accepting it. After the events of the 18th of March, on their wild flight to Versailles, the *capitulards*[2] left in the hands of Paris the documentary evidence of their treason, to destroy which, as the Commune says in its manifesto to the provinces, "those men would not recoil from a sea of blood."

To be eagerly bent upon such a consummation, some of the leading mem-

[1] "Let him alone: he has his plan," was a plea frequently offered in defence of Trochu.
[2] "Capitulators"—an abusive term for the Thiers Government.

bers of the Government of Defence had, besides, most peculiar reasons of their own.

Shortly after the conclusion of the armistice, M. Millière, one of the representatives of Paris to the National Assembly, now shot by express order of Jules Favre, published a series of authentic legal documents in proof that Jules Favre, living in concubinage with the wife of a drunkard resident at Algiers, had, by a most daring concoction of forgeries, spread over many years, contrived to grasp in the name of the children of his adultery, a large succession, which made him a rich man, and that, in a lawsuit undertaken by the legitimate heirs, he only escaped exposure by the connivance of the Bonapartist tribunals. As these dry legal documents were not to be got rid of by any amount of rhetorical horse-power, Jules Favre, for the first time in his life, held his tongue, quietly awaiting the outbreak of the civil war, in order, then, frantically to denounce the people of Paris as a band of escaped convicts in utter revolt against family, religion, order, and property. This same forger had hardly got into power, after the 4th of September, when he sympathetically let loose upon society Pic and Taillefer, convicted, even under the Empire of forgery, in the scandalous affair of the "Étendard." One of these men, Taillefer, having dared to return to Paris under the Commune, was at once reinstated in prison; and then Jules Favre exclaimed, from the tribune of the National Assembly, that Paris was setting free all her jailbirds!

Ernest Picard, the Joe Miller of the Government of National Defence, who appointed himself Home Minister of the Republic after having in vain striven to become Home Minister of the Empire, is the brother of one Arthur Picard, an individual expelled from the Paris Bourse as a blackleg (see report of the Prefecture of Police, dated 13th July, 1867), and convicted, on his own confession, of a theft of 300,000 francs, while manager of one of the branches of the *Société Générale*, rue Palestro, No. 5 (see report of the Prefecture of Police, 11th December, 1868). This Arthur Picard was made by Ernest Picard the editor of his paper, *l'Électeur Libre*. While the common run of stockjobbers were led astray by the official lies of the Home Office paper, Arthur was running backwards and forwards between the Home Office and the Bourse, there to discount the disasters of the French army. The whole financial correspondence of that worthy pair of brothers fell into the hands of the Commune.

Jules Ferry, a penniless barrister before the 4th of September, contrived, as Mayor of Paris during the siege, to job a fortune out of famine. The day on which he would have to give an account of his maladministration would be the day of his conviction.

These men, then, could find, in the ruins of Paris only, their tickets-of-leave: they were the very men Bismarck wanted. With the help of some shuffling of cards, Thiers, hitherto the secret prompter of the Government, now appeared at its head, with the ticket-of-leave men for his Ministers.

Thiers, that monstrous gnome, has charmed the French bourgeoisie for almost half a century, because he is the most consummate intellectual expression

of their own class-corruption. Before he became a statesman he had already proved his lying powers as an historian. The chronicle of his public life is the record of misfortunes of France. Banded, before 1830, with the Republicans, he slipped into office under Louis Philippe by betraying his protector Laffite, ingratiating himself with the king by exciting mob riots against the clergy, during which the church of Saint Germain l'Auxerrois and the Archbishop's palace were plundered, and by acting the minister-spy upon, and the jail-accoucheur of the Duchess de Berri. The massacre of the Republicans in the Rue Transnonain, and the subsequent infamous laws of September against the press and the right of association, were his work. Reappearing as the chief of the Cabinet in March, 1840, he astonished France with his plan of fortifying Paris. To the Republicans, who denounced this plan as a sinister plot against the liberty of Paris, he replied from the tribune of the Chamber of Deputies:—

"What! to fancy that any works of fortification could ever endanger liberty! And first of all you calumniate any possible Government in supposing that it could some day attempt to maintain itself by bombarding the capital . . . but that Government would be a hundred times more impossible after its victory than before." Indeed, no Government would ever have dared to bombard Paris from the forts but that Government which had previously surrendered these forts to the Prussians.

When King Bomba tried his hand at Palermo, in January, 1848, Thiers, then long since out of office, again rose in the Chamber of Deputies: "You know, gentlemen, what is happening at Palermo. You, all of you, shake with horror (in the parliamentary sense) on hearing that during forty-eight hours a large town has been bombarded—by whom? Was it by a foreign enemy exercising the right of war? No, gentlemen, it was by its own Government. And why? Because the unfortunate town demanded its rights. Well, then, for the demand of its rights it has got forty-eight hours of bombardment . . . . Allow me to appeal to the opinion of Europe. It is doing a service to mankind to arise, and to make reverberate, from what is perhaps the greatest tribune in Europe, some words (indeed words) of indignation against such acts . . . . When the Regent Espartero, who had rendered services in his country (which M. Thiers never did) intended bombarding Barcelona, in order to suppress its insurrection, there arose from all parts of the world a general outcry of indignation."

Eighteen months afterwards, M. Thiers was amongst the fiercest defenders of the bombardment of Rome by a French army. In fact the fault of King Bomba seems to have consisted of this only, that he limited his bombardment to forty-eight hours.

A few days before the Revolution of February, fretting at the long exile from place and pelf to which Guizot had condemned him and sniffing in the air the scent of an approaching popular commotion, Thiers, in that pseudo-heroic style which won him the nick-name of *Mirabeau-mouche*,[1] declared to

[1] The Insect Mirabeau.

the Chamber of Duputies: "I am of the party of Revolution, not only in France, but in Europe. I wish the Government of the Revolution to remain in the hands of moderate men . . . . but if the Government should fall into the hands of ardent minds, even into those of Radicals, I shall, for all that, not desert my cause. I shall always be of the party of the Revolution." The Revolution of February came. Instead of displacing the Guizot Cabinet by the Thiers Cabinet, as the little man had dreamt, it superseded Louis Philippe by the Republic. On the first day of the popular victory he carefully hid himself, forgetting that the contempt of the working men screened him from their hatred. Still with his legendary courage, he continued to shy the public stage, until the June massacres had cleared it for his sort of action. Then he become the leading mind of the "Party of Order" and its Parliamentary Republic, that anonymous interregnum, in which all the rival factions of the ruling class conspired together to crush the people, and conspired against each other to restore each of them its own monarchy. Then as now, Thiers denounced the Republicans as the only obstacle to the consolidation of the Republic; then, as now he spoke to the Republic as the hangman spoke to Don Carlos:—"I shall assassinate thee, but for thy own good." Now, as then, he will have to exclaim on the day after his victory: *L'Empire est fait*—the empire is consummated. Despite his hypocritical homilies about necessary liberties and his personal grudge against Louis Bonaparte, who had made a dupe of him, and kicked out parliamentarism—and outside of its factitious atmosphere the little man is conscious of withering into nothingness—he had a hand in all the infamies of the Second Empire, from the occupation of Rome by French troops to the war with Prussia, which he incited by his fierce invective against German unity—not as a cloak of Prussian despotism but as an encroachment upon the vested right of France in German disunion. Fond of brandishing, with his dwarfish arms in the face of Europe the sword of the first Napoleon whose historical shoeblack he had become,[1] his foreign policy always culminated in the utter humiliation of France from the London convention of 1841 to the Paris capitulation of 1871 and the present civil war, where he hounds on the prisoners of Sedan and Metz against Paris by special permission of Bismarck. Despite his versatility of talent and shiftiness of purpose, this man has his whole lifetime been wedded to the most fossil routine. It is self-evident that to him the deeper undercurrents of modern society remained forever hidden; but even the most palpable changes on its surface were abhorrent to a brain all the vitality of which had fled to the tongue. Thus he never tired of denouncing as a sacrilege any deviation from the old French protective system. When a minister of Louis Philippe, he railed at railways as a wild chimera; and when in opposition under Louis Bonaparte, he branded as a profanation every attempt to reform the rotten French army system. Never in his long political career has he been guilty of a single—even the smallest—measure of any practical use. Thiers was consistent only in his greed for wealth and his

[1] Thiers was the author of a long and appreciative History of the First Empire.

hatred of the men that produce it. Having entered his first ministry under Louis Philippe poor as Job, he left it a millionaire. His last ministry under the same king (of the 1st of March, 1840) exposed him to public taunts of peculation in the Chamber of Deputies, to which he was content to reply by tears —a commodity he deals in as freely as Jules Favre, or any other crocodile. At Bordeaux his first measure for saving France from impending financial ruin was to endow himself with three millions a year, the first and the last word of the "Economical Republic," the vista of which he had opened to his Paris electors in 1869. One of his former colleagues of the Chamber of Deputies of 1830, himself a capitalist and nevertheless a devoted member of the Paris Commune, M. Beslay, lately addressed Thiers, thus in a public placard:— "The enslavement of labor by capital has always been the corner-stone of your policy, and from the very day you saw the Republic of Labor installed at the Hotel de Ville, you have never ceased to cry out to France: 'These are criminals!'" A master in small state roguery, a virtuoso in perjury and treason, a craftsman in all the petty stratagems, cunning devices and base perfidies of Parliamentary party-warfare; never scrupling, when out of office, to fan a revolution, and to stifle it in blood when at the helm of the State; with class prejudices standing him in the place of ideas, and vanity in the place of a heart; his private life as infamous as his public life is odious— even now, when playing the part of a French Sulla, he cannot help setting off the abomination of his deeds by the ridicule of his ostentation.

The capitulation of Paris by surrendering to Prussia, not only Paris, but all France, closed the long-continued intrigues or treason with the enemy, which the usurpers of the 4th September began, as Trochu himself said, on that very same day. On the other hand, it initiated the civil war they were now to wage with the assistance of Prussia, against the Republic and Paris. The trap was laid in the very terms of the capitulation. At that time above one-third of the territory was in the hands of the enemy, the capital was cut off from the provinces, all communications were disorganized. To elect under such circumstances a real representation of France was impossible unless ample time were given for preparation. In view of this the capitulation stipulated that a National Assembly must be elected within eight days; so that in many parts of France the news of the impending election arrived on its eve only. This assembly, moreover, was, by an express clause of the capitulation, to be elected for the sole purpose of deciding on peace or war, and, eventually, to conclude a treaty of peace. The population could not but feel that the terms of the armistice rendered the continuation of the war impossible, and that for sanctioning the peace imposed by Bismarck, the worst men in France were the best. But not content with these precautions, Thiers, even before the secret of the armistice had been broached to Paris, set out for an electioneering tour through the provinces, there to galvanize back into life the Legitimist party, which now, along with the Orleanists, had to take the place of the then impossible Bonapartists. He was not afraid of them. Impossible as a government of modern France, and therefore, contemptible

as rivals, what party were more eligible as tools of counter-revolution than the party whose action, in the words of Thiers himself (Chamber of Deputies, 5th January, 1833), "had always been confined to the three resources of foreign invasion, civil war, and anarchy"? They verily believed in the advent of their long expected retrospective millennium. There were the heels of foreign invasion trampling upon France; there was the downfall of an Empire, and the captivity of a Bonaparte; and there they were themselves. The wheel of history has evidently rolled back to stop at the "Chambre introuvable" of 1816. In the assemblies of the Republic, 1848 to '51, they had been represented by their educated and trained Parliamentary champions; it was the rank-and-file of the party which now rushed in—all the Pourceaugnacs of France.

As soon as this assembly of "Rurals" had met at Bordeaux, Thiers made it clear to them that the peace preliminaries must be assented to at once, without even the honors of a Parliamentary debate, as the only condition on which Prussia would permit them to open the war against the Republic and Paris, its stronghold. The counter-revolution had, in fact, no time to lose. The Second Empire had more than doubled the national debt, and plunged all the large towns into heavy municipal debts. The war had fearfully swelled the liabilities, and mercilessly ravaged the resources of the nation. To complete the ruin, the Prussian Shylock was there with his bond for the keep of half a million of his soldiers on French soil, his indemnity of five milliards and interest at 5 per cent. on the unpaid instalments thereof. Who was to pay the bill? It was only by the violent overthrow of the Republic that the appropriators of wealth could hope to shift on to the shoulders of its producers the cost of a war which they, the appropriators, had themselves originated. Thus, the immense ruin of France spurred on these patriotic representatives of land and capital, under the very eyes and patronage of the invader, to graft upon the foreign war a civil war—a slaveholders' rebellion.

There stood in the way of this conspiracy one great obstacle—Paris. To disarm Paris was the first condition of success. Paris was therefore summoned by Thiers to surrender its arms. Then Paris was exasperated by the frantic anti-republican demonstrations of the "Rural" Assembly and by Thiers's own equivocations about the legal status of the Republic; by the threat to decapitate and decapitalize Paris; the appointment of Orleanist ambassadors; Dufaure's laws on over-due commercial bills and house rents, inflicting ruin on the commerce and industry of Paris; Pouyer-Quertier's tax of two centimes upon every copy of every imaginable publication; the sentences of death against Blanqui and Flourens; the suppression of the Republican journals; the transfer of the National Assembly to Versailles; the renewal of the state of siege declared by Palikao, and expired on the 4th of September; the appointment of Vinoy, the *Décembriseur*,[1] as governor of Paris—of Valentin, the imperialist *gendarme*, as its prefect of police—and of D'Aurelles de Paladine, the Jesuit general, as the commander-in-chief of its National Guard.

[1] "Man of [the 2nd] December [1851]."

And now we have to address a question to M. Thiers and the men of national defence, his under-strappers. It is known that, through the agency of M. Pouyer Quertier, his finance minister, Thiers had contracted a loan of two milliards, to be paid down at once. Now, is it true or not—

1. That the business was so managed that a consideration of several hundred millions was secured for the private benefit of Thiers, Jules Favre, Ernest Picard, Pouyer-Quertier, and Jules Simon? and—

2. That no money was to be paid down until after the "pacification" of Paris?

At all events, there must have been something very pressing in the matter, for Thiers and Jules Favre, in the name of the majority of the Bordeaux Assembly, unblushingly solicited the immediate occupation of Paris by Prussian troops. Such, however, was not the game of Bismarck, as he sneeringly, and in public, told the admiring Frankfort Philistines on his return to Germany.

II.

ARMED Paris was the only serious obstacle in the way of counter-revolutionary conspiracy. Paris was, therefore, to be disarmed. On this point the Bordeaux Assembly was sincerity itself. If the roaring rant of its Rurals had not been audible enough, the surrender of Paris by Thiers to the tender mercies of the triumvirate of Vinoy the *Décembriseur*, Valentin the Bonapartist *gendarme*, and Aurelles de Paladine the Jesuit general, would have cut off even the last subterfuge of doubt. But while insultingly exhibiting the true purpose of the disarmament of Paris, the conspirators asked her to lay down her arms on a pretext which was the most glaring, the most barefaced of lies. The artillery of the Paris National Guard, said Thiers, belonged to the State, and to the State it must be returned. The fact is this:—From the very day of the capitulation, by which Bismarck's prisoners had signed the surrender of France, but reserved to themselves a numerous bodyguard for the express purpose of cowing Paris, Paris stood on the watch. The National Guard reorganised themselves and intrusted their supreme control to a Central Committee elected by their whole body, save some fragments of the old Bonapartist formation. On the eve of the entrance of the Prussians into Paris, the Central Committee took measures for the removal to Montmartre, Belleville, and La Villette of the cannon and mitrailleuses treacherously abandoned by the *capitulards* in and about the very quarters the Prussians were to occupy. That artillery had been furnished by the subscriptions of the National Guard. As their private property, it was officially recognised in the capitulation of the 28th of January, and on that very title exempted from the general surrender, into the hands of the conqueror, of arms belonging to the Government. And Thiers was so utterly destitute of even the flimsiest pretext for initiating the war against Paris, that he had to resort to the flagrant lie of the artillery of the National Guard being State property!

The seizure of her artillery was evidently but to serve as the preliminary to the general disarmament of Paris, and, therefore, of the Revolution of the

4th of September. But that Revolution had become the legal status of France. The Republic, its work, was recognized by the conqueror in the terms of the capitulation. After the capitulation, it was acknowledged by all the foreign Powers, and in its name the National Assembly had been summoned. The Paris working-men's revolution of the 4th of September was the only legal title of the National Assembly seated at Bordeaux, and of its executive. Without it, the National Assembly would at once have to give way to the Corps Legislatif, elected in 1869 by universal suffrage under French, not under Prussian, rule, and forcibly dispersed by the arm of the Revolution. Thiers and his ticket-of-leave men would have had to capitulate for safe conducts signed by Louis Bonaparte, to save them from a voyage to Cayenne. The National Assembly, with its power of attorney to settle the terms of peace with Prussia, was but an incident of that Revolution, the true embodiment of which was still armed Paris, which had initiated it, undergone for it a five months siege, with its horrors of famine, and made her prolonged resistance, despite Trochu's plan, the basis of an obstinate war of defence in the provinces. And Paris was now either to lay down her arms at the insulting behest of the rebellious slaveholders of Bordeaux, and acknowledge that her Revolution of the 4th of September meant nothing but a simple transfer of power from Louis Bonaparte to his Royal rivals; or she had to stand forward as the self-sacrificing champion of France, whose salvation from ruin, and whose regeneration were impossible, without the revolutionary overthrow of the political and social conditions that had engendered the second Empire, and, under its fostering care, matured into utter rottenness. Paris, emaciated by a five months' famine, did not hesitate one moment. She heroically resolved to run all the hazards of a resistance against the French conspirators, even with Prussian cannon frowning upon her from her own forts. Still, in its abhorrence of the civil war into which Paris was to be goaded, the Central Committee continued to persist in a merely defensive attitude, despite the provocations of the Assembly, the usurpations of the Executive, and the menacing concentration of troops in and around Paris.

Thiers opened the civil war by sending Vinoy, at the head of a multitude of *sergents-de-ville* and some regiments of the line, upon a nocturnal expedition against Montmartre, there to seize, by surprise, the artillery of the National Guard. It is well known how this attempt broke down before the resistance of the National Guard and the fraternization of the line with the people. Aurelles de Paladine had printed beforehand his bulletin of victory, and Thiers held ready the placards announcing his measures of *coup d'etat*. Now these had to be replaced by Thiers' appeals, imparting his magnanimous resolve to leave the National Guard in the possession of their arms, with which, he said, he felt sure they would rally round the Government against the rebels. Out of 300,000 National Guards only 300 responded to this summons to rally round little Thiers against themselves. The glorious working men's Revolution of the 18th March took undisputed sway of Paris. The Central Committee was its provisional Government. Europe seemed, for a moment, to

doubt whether its recent sensational performances of state and war had any reality in them, or whether they were the dreams of a long bygone past.

From the 18th of March to the entrance of the Versailles troops into Paris, the proletarian revolution remained so free from the acts of violence in which the revolutions, and still more the counter-revolutions, of the "better classes" abound, that no facts were left to its opponents to cry out about, but the execution of Generals Lecomte and Clement Thomas, and the affair of the Place Vendome.

One of the Bonapartist officers engaged in the nocturnal attempt against Montmartre, General Lecomte, had four times ordered the 81st line regiment to fire at an unarmed gathering in the Place Pigalle, and on their refusal fiercely insulted them. Instead of shooting women and children, his own men shot him. The inveterate habits acquired by the soldiery under the training of the enemies of the working class are, of course, not likely to change the very moment these soldiers change sides. The same men executed Clement Thomas.

"General" Clement Thomas, a malcontent ex-quartermaster-sergeant, had, in the latter times of Louis Philippe's reign, enlisted at the office of the Republican newspaper *Le national*, there to serve in the double capacity of responsible man-of-straw (*gérant responsable*) and of duelling bully to that very combative journal. After the revolution of February, the men of the *National* having got into power, they metamorphosed this old quartermaster-sergeant into a general on the eve of the butchery of June, of which he, like Jules Favre, was one of the sinister plotters, and became one of the most dastardly executioners. Then he and his generalship disappeared for a long time, to again rise to the surface on the 1st November, 1870. The day before the Government of Defence, caught at the Hotel de Ville, had solemnly pledged their parole to Blanqui, Flourens, and other representatives of the working class, to abdicate their usurped power into the hands of a commune to be freely elected by Paris. Instead of keeping their word, they let loose on Paris the Bretons of Trochu, who now replaced the Corsicans of Bonaparte. General Tamisier alone, refusing to sully his name by such a breach of faith, resigned the commandership-in-chief of the National Guard, and in his place Clement Thomas for once became again a general. During the whole of his tenure of command, he made war, not upon the Prussians, but upon the Paris National Guard. He prevented their general armament, pitted the bourgeois battalions against the working men's battalions, weeded out the officers hostile to Trochu's "plan," and disbanded, under the stigma of cowardice, the very same proletarian battalions whose heroism has now astonished their most inveterate enemies. Clement Thomas felt quite proud of having reconquered his June pre-eminences as the personal enemy of the working class of Paris. Only a few days before the 18th of March, he laid before the War Minister, Leflô, a plan of his own for "finishing off *la fine fleur* (the cream) of the Paris *canaille*." After Vinoy's rout, he must needs appear upon the scene of action in the quality of an amateur spy. The Central Committee

and the Paris working men were as much responsible for the killing of Clement Thomas and Lecomte as the Princess of Wales for the fate of the people crushed to death on the day of her entrance into London.

The massacre of unarmed citizens in the Place Vendome is a myth which M. Thiers and the Rurals persistently ignored in the Assembly, entrusting its propagation exclusively to the servants' hall of European journalism. "The men of order" the reactionists of Paris, trembled at the victory of the 18th of March. To them it was the signal of popular retribution at last arriving. The ghosts of the victims assassinated at their hands from the days of June, 1848, down to the 22nd of January, 1871, arose before their faces. Their panic was their only punishment. Even the sergents-de-ville, instead of being disarmed and locked up, as ought to have been done, had the gates of Paris flung wide open for their safe retreat to Versailles. The men of order were left not only unharmed, but allowed to rally and quietly to seize more than one stronghold in the very centre of Paris. This indulgence of the Central Committee—this magnanimity of the armed working men—so strangely at variance with the habits of the "party of order," the latter misinterpreted as mere symptoms of conscious weakness. Hence their silly plan to try, under the cloak of an unarmed demonstration, what Vinoy had failed to perform with his cannon and mitrailleuses. On the 22nd of March a riotous mob of swells started from the quarters of luxury, all the *petits crevés* in their ranks, and at their head the notorious familiars of the Empire—the Heeckeren, Coëtlogon, Henri de Pène, etc. Under the cowardly pretence of a pacific demonstration, this rabble, secretly armed with the weapons of the bravo, fell into marching order, illtreated and disarmed the detached patrols and sentries of the National Guard they met with on their progress, and, on debouching from the Rue de la Paix, with the cry of "Down with the Central Committee! Down with the assassins! The National Assembly for ever!" attempted to break through the line drawn up there, and thus to carry by a surprise the head-quarters of the National Guard in the Place Vendome. In reply to their pistol-shots, the regular *sommations* (the French equivalent of the English Riot Act) were made, and, proving ineffective, fire was commanded by the general of the National Guard. One volley dispersed into wild flight the silly coxcombs, who expected that the mere exhibition of their "respectability" would have the same effect upon the Revolution of Paris as Joshua's trumpets upon the walls of Jericho. The runaways left behind them two National Guards killed, nine severely wounded (among them a member of the Central Committee), and the whole scene of their exploit strewn with revolvers, daggers, and sword-canes, in evidence of the "unarmed" character of their "pacific" demonstration. When, on the 13th of June, 1849, the National Guard made a really pacific demonstration in protest against the felonious assault of French troops upon Rome, Changarnier, then general of the party of order, was acclaimed by the National Assembly, and especially by M. Thiers, as the saviour of society, for having launched his troops from all sides upon these unarmed men, to shoot and sabre them down, and to trample them under

their horses' feet. Paris, then, was placed in a state of siege. Dufaure hurried through the Assembly new laws of repression. New arrests, new proscriptions—a new reign of terror set in. But the lower orders manage these things otherwise. The Central Committee of 1871 simply ignored the heroes of the "pacific demonstration;" so much so, that only two days later they were enabled to muster under Admiral Saisset, for that *armed* demonstration, crowned by the famous stampede to Versailles. In their reluctance to continue the civil war opened by Thiers' burglarious attempt on Montmartre, the Central Committee made themselves, this time, guilty of a decisive mistake in not at once marching upon Versailles, then completely helpless, and thus putting an end to the conspiracies of Thiers and his Rurals. Instead of this, the party of order was again allowed to try its strength at the ballot-box, on the 26th of March, the day of the election of the Commune. Then, in the mairies of Paris, they exchanged bland words of conciliation with their too generous conquerors, muttering in their hearts solemn vows to exterminate them in due time.

Now, look at the reverse of the medal. Thiers opened his second campaign against Paris in the beginning of April. The first batch of Parisian prisoners brought into Versailles was subjected to revolting atrocities, while Ernest Picard, with his hands in his trousers pockets, strolled about jeering them, and while Mesdames Thiers and Favre, in the midst of their ladies of honour applauded, from the balcony, the outrages of the Versailles mob. The captured soldiers of the line were massacred in cold blood; our brave friend, General Duval, the ironfounder, was shot without any form of trial. Gallifet, the kept man of his wife, so notorious for her shameless exhibitions at the orgies of the Second Empire, boasted in a proclamation of having commanded the murder of a small troop of National Guards, with their captain and lieutenant, surprised and disarmed by his Chasseurs. Vinoy, the runaway, was appointed Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour by Thiers, for his general order to shoot down every soldier of the line taken in the ranks of the Federals. Desmaret, the gendarme, was decorated for the treacherous butcher-like chopping in pieces of the high-souled and chivalrous Flourens, who had saved the heads of the Government of Defence on the 31st of October, 1870. "The encouraging particulars" of his assassination were triumphantly expatiated upon by Thiers in the National Assembly. With the elevated vanity of a parliamentary Tom Thumb, permitted to play the part of a Tamerlane, he denied the rebels against his littleness every right of civilized warfare, up to the right of neutrality for ambulances. Nothing more horrid than that monkey allowed for a time to give full fling to his tigerish instincts, as foreseen by Voltaire.

After the decree of the Commune of the 7th April ordering reprisals and declaring it to be its duty "to protect Paris against the cannibal exploits of the Versailles banditti, and to demand an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth," Thiers did not stop the barbarous treatment of prisoners, moreover insulting them in his bulletins as follows:—"Never have more degraded countenances

of a degraded democracy met the afflicted gaze of honest men,"—honest, like Thiers himself and his ministerial ticket-of-leave men. Still the shooting of prisoners was suspended for a time. Hardly, however, had Thiers and his Decembrist generals become aware that the Communal decree of reprisals was but an empty threat, that even their gendarme spies caught in Paris under the disguise of National Guards, that even sergents-de-ville taken with incendiary shells upon them, were spared,—when the wholesale shooting of prisoners was resumed and carried on uninterruptedly to the end. Houses to which National Guards had fled were surrounded by gendarmes, inundated with petroleum (which here occurs for the first time in this war), and then set fire to, the charred corpses being afterwards brought out by the ambulance of the Press at the Ternes. Four National Guards having surrendered to a troop of mounted Chasseurs at Belle Epine, on the 25th of April, were afterwards shot down, one after another, by the captain, a worthy man of Gallifet's. One of his four victims, left for dead, Scheffer, crawled back to the Parisian outposts, and deposed to this fact before a commission of the Commune. When Tolain interpellated the War Minister upon the report of this commission, the Rurals drowned his voice and forbade Leflô to answer. It would be an insult to their "glorious" army to speak of its deeds. The flippant tone in which Thiers' bulletins announced the bayoneting of the Federals surprised asleep at Moulin Saquet, and the wholesale fusillades at Clamart shocked the nerves even of the not over-sensitive London *Times*. But it would be ludicrous to-day to attempt recounting the merely preliminary atrocities committed by the bombarders of Paris and the fomenters of a slaveholders' rebellion protected by foreign invasion. Amidst all these horrors Thiers, forgetful of his parliamentary laments on the terrible responsibility weighing down his dwarfish shoulders, boasts in his bulletins that *l'Assemblée siège paisiblement* (the Assembly continues meeting in peace), and proves by his constant carousals, now with Decembrist generals, now with German princes, that his digestion is not troubled in the least, not even by the ghosts of Lecomte and Clement Thomas.

III.

ON the dawn of the 18th of March, Paris arose to the thunderburst of "Vive la Commune!" What is the Commune, that sphinx so tantalizing to the bourgeois mind?

"The proletarians of Paris," said the Central Committee in its manifesto of the 18th Marco, "amidst the failures and treasons of the ruling classes, have understood that the hour has struck for them to save the situation by taking into their own hands the direction of public affairs . . . . They have understood that it is their imperious duty and their absolute right to render themselves masters of their own destinies, by seizing upon the governmental power." But the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.

The centralized State power, with its ubiquitous organs of standing army, police, bureaucracy, clergy, and judicature—organs wrought after the plan

of a systematic and hierarchic division of labour—originates from the days of absolute monarchy, serving nascent middle-class society as a mighty weapon in its struggles against feudalism. Still, its development remained clogged by all manner of mediæval rubbish, seignorial rights, local privileges, municipal and guild monopolies and provincial constitutions. The gigantic broom of the French Revolution of the eighteenth century swept away all these relics of bygone times, thus clearing simultaneously the social soil of its last hindrances to the superstructure of the modern State edifice raised under the First Empire, itself the offspring of the coalition wars of old semi-feudal Europe against modern France. During the subsequent *régimes* the Government, placed under parliamentary control—that is, under the direct control of the propertied classes—became not only a hotbed of huge national debts and crushing taxes; with its irresistible allurements of place, pelf, and patronage, it became not only the bone of contention between the rival factions and adventurers of the ruling classes; but its political character changed simultaneously with the economic changes of society. At the same pace at which the progress of modern industry developed, widened, intensified the class antagonism between capital and labour, the State power assumed more and more the character of the national power of capital over labour, of a public force organized for social enslavement, of an engine of class despotism. After every revolution marking a progressive phase in the class struggle, the purely repressive character of the State power stands out in bolder and bolder relief. The revolution of 1830, resulting in the transfer of Government from the landlords to the capitalists transferred it from the more remote to the more direct antagonists of the working men. The bourgeois Republicans, who, in the name of the Revolution of February, took the State power, used it for the June massacres, in order to convince the working class that "social" republic meant the republic ensuring their social subjection, and in order to convince the royalist bulk of the bourgeois and landlord class that they might safely leave the cares and emoluments of government to the bourgeois "Republicans." However, after their one heroic exploit of June, the bourgeois Republicans had, from the front, to fall back to the rear of the "Party of Order"—a combination formed by all the rival fractions and factions of the appropriating class in their now openly declared antagonism to the producing classes. The proper form of their joint stock Government was the *Parliamentary Republic*, with Louis Bonaparte for its President. Theirs was a *régime* of avowed class terrorism and deliberate insult towards the "vile multitude." If the Parliamentary Republic, as M. Thiers said, "divided them (the different fractions of the ruling class) least," it opened an abyss between that class and the whole body of society outside their spare ranks. The restraints by which their own divisions had under former *régimes* still checked the State power, were removed by their union; and in view of the threatening upheaval of the proletariat, they now used that State power mercilessly and ostentatiously as the national war engine of capital against labour. In their uninterrupted crusade against the producing masses they were, however, bound not only to

invest the executive with continually increased powers of repression, but at the same time to divest their own parliamentary stronghold—the National Assembly—one by one, of all its own means of defence against the Executive. The Executive, in the person of Louis Bonaparte, turned them out. The natural offspring of the "Party-of-Order" Republic was the Second Empire.

The Empire, with the *coup d'état* for its certificate of birth, universal suffrage for its sanction, and the sword for its sceptre, professed to rest upon the peasantry, the large mass of producers not directly involved in the struggle of capital and labour. It professed to save the working class by breaking down Parliamentarism, and, with it, the undisguised subserviency of Government to the propertied classes. It professed to save the propertied classes by upholding their economic supremacy over the working class; and, finally, it professed to unite all classes by reviving for all the chimera of national glory. In reality, it was the only form of government possible at a time when the bourgeoisie had already lost, and the working class had not yet acquired the faculty of ruling the nation. It was acclaimed throughout the world as the saviour of society. Under its sway, bourgeois society, freed from political cares, attained a development unexpected even by itself. Its industry and commerce expanded to colossal dimensions; financial swindling celebrated cosmopolitan orgies; the misery of the masses was set off by a shameless display of gorgeous, meretricious, and debased luxury. The State power, apparently soaring high above society, was at the same time itself the greatest scandal of that society and the very hotbed of all its corruptions. Its own rottenness, and the rottenness of the society it had saved, were laid bare by the bayonet of Prussia, herself eagerly bent upon transferring the supreme seat of that *régime* from Paris to Berlin. Imperialism is, at the same time, the most prostitute and the ultimate form of the State power which nascent middle-class society had commenced to elaborate as a means of its own emancipation from feudalism, and which full-grown bourgeois society had finally transformed into a means for the enslavement of labour by capital.

The direct antithesis to the Empire was the Commune. The cry of "Social Republic," with which the revolution of February was ushered in by the Paris proletariat, did but express a vague aspiration after a Republic that was not only to supersede the monarchial form of class-rule, but class-rule itself. The Commune was the positive form of that Republic.

Paris, the central seat of the old governmental power, and, at the same time, the social stronghold of the French working class, had risen in arms against the attempt of Thiers and the Rurals to restore and perpetuate that old governmental power bequeathed to them by the Empire. Paris could resist only because, in consequence of the siege, it had got rid of the army, and replaced it by a National Guard, the bulk of which consisted of working men. This fact was now to be transformed into an institution. The first degree of the Commune, therefore, was the suppression of the standing army, and the substitution for it of the armed people.

The Commune was formed of the municipal councillors, chosen by

universal suffrage in various wards of the town, responsible and revocable at short terms. The majority of its members were naturally working men, or acknowledged representatives of the working class. The Commune was to be a working, not a parliamentary body, executive and legislative at the same time. Instead of continuing to be the agent of the Central Government, the police was at once stripped of its political attributes, and turned into the responsible and at all times revocable agent of the Commune. So were the officials of all other branches of the Administration. From the members of the Commune downwards, the public service had to be done at *workmen's wages*. The vested interests and the representation allowances of the high dignitaries of State disappeared along with the high dignitaries themselves. Public functions ceased to be the private property of the tools of the Central Government. Not only municipal administration, but the whole initiative hitherto exercised by the State was laid into the hands of the Commune.

Having once got rid of the standing army and the police, the physical force elements of the old Government, the Commune was anxious to break the spiritual force of repression, the "parson-power," by the disestablishment and disendowment of all churches as proprietary bodies. The priests were sent back to the recesses of private life, there to feed upon the alms of the faithful in imitation of their predecessors, the Apostles. The whole of the educational institutions were opened to the people gratuitously, and at the same time cleared of all interference of Church and State. Thus, not only was education made accessible to all, but science itself freed from the fetters which class prejudice and governmental force had imposed upon it.

The judicial functionaries were to be divested of that sham independence which had but served to mask their abject subserviency to all succeeding governments to which in turn, they had taken, and broken, the oaths of allegiance. Like the rest of public servants, magistrates and judges were to be elective, responsible and revocable.

The Paris Commune was, of course, to serve as a model to all the great industrial centres of France. The communal *régime* once established in Paris and the secondary centres, the old centralized Government would in the provinces, too, have to give way to the self-government of the producers. In a rough sketch of national organization which the Commune had no time to develop, it states clearly that the Commune was to be the political form of even the smallest country hamlet, and that in the rural districts the standing army was to be replaced by a national militia, with an extremely short term of service. The rural communes of every district were to administer their common affairs by an assembly of delegates in the central town, and these district assemblies were again to send deputies to the National Delegation in Paris, each delegate to be at any time revocable and bound by the *mandat imperatif* (formal instructions) of his constituents. The few but important functions which still would remain for a central government were not to be suppressed, as has been intentionally misstated, but were to be discharged by Communal, and therefore strictly responsible agents. The unity of the nation was not to

be broken; but, on the contrary, to be organized by the Communal constitution, and to become a reality by the destruction of the State power which claimed to be the embodiment of that unity independent of, and superior to, the nation itself, from which it was but a parasitic excrescence. While the merely repressive organs of the old governmental power were to be amputated, its legitimate functions were to be wrested from an authority usurping pre-eminence over society itself, and restored to the responsible agents of society. Instead of deciding once in three or six years which member of the ruling class was to represent the people in Parliament, universal suffrage was to serve the people, constituted in Communes, as individual suffrage serves every other employer in the search for the workmen and managers in his business. And it is well known that companies, like individuals, in matters of real business generally know how to put the right man in the right place, and, if they for once make a mistake, to redress it promptly. On the other hand, nothing could be more foreign to the spirit of the Commune than to supersede universal suffrage by hierarchic investiture.

It is generally the fate of completely new historical creations to be mistaken for the counterpart of older and even defunct forms of social life, to which they may bear a certain likeness. Thus, this new Commune, which breaks the modern State power, has been mistaken for a reproduction of the mediæval Communes, which first preceded, and afterwards became the substratum of, that very State power. The communal constitution has been mistaken for an attempt to break up into a federation of small States, as dreamt of by Montesquieu and the Girondins, that unity of great nations which, if originally brought about by political force, has now become a powerful coefficient of social production. The antagonism of the Commune against the State power has been mistaken for an exaggerated form of the ancient struggle against over-centralization. Peculiar historical circumstances may have prevented the classical development, as in France, of the bourgeois form of government, and may have allowed, as in England, to complete the great central State organs by corrupt vestries, jobbing councillors, and ferocious poor-law guardians in the towns, and, virtually hereditary magistrates in the counties. The Communal Constitution would have restored to the social body all the forces hitherto absorbed by the State parasite feeding upon, and clogging the free movement of, society. By this one act it would have initiated the regeneration of France. The provincial French middle-class saw in the Commune an attempt to restore the sway their order had held over the country under Louis Philippe, and which, under Louis Napoleon, was supplanted by the pretended rule of the country over the towns. In reality, the Communal Constitution brought the rural producers under the intellectual lead of the central towns of their districts, and there secured to them, in the working man, the natural trustees of their interests. The very existence of the Commune involved, as a matter of course, local municipal liberty, but no longer as a check upon the, now superseded State power. It could only enter into the head of a Bismarck, who, when not engaged on

his intrigues of blood and iron, always likes to resume his old trade, so befitting his mental calibre, of contributor to *Kladderadatsch* (the Berlin *Punch*), it could only enter in such a head, to ascribe to the Paris Commune aspirations after that caricature of the old French municipal organization of 1791, the Prussian municipal constitution which degrades the town governments to mere secondary wheels in the police machinery of the Prussian State. The Commune made that catchword of bourgeois revolutions, cheap government, a reality by destroying the two greatest sources of expenditure—the standing army and State functionarism. Its very existence presupposed the non-existence of monarchy, which, in Europe at least, is the normal incumbrance and indispensable cloak of class-rule. It supplied the Republic with the basis of really democratic institutions. But neither cheap government nor the "true Republic" was its ultimate aim; they were its mere concomitants.

The multiplicity of interpretations to which the Commune has been subjected, and the multiplicity of interests which construed it in their favour, show that it was a thoroughly expansive political form, while all previous forms of government had been emphatically repressive. Its true secret was this. It was essentially a working-class government, the produce of the struggle of the producing against the appropriating class, the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economical emancipation of Labour.

Except on this last condition, the Communal Constitution would have been an impossibility and a delusion. The political rule of the producer cannot coexist with the perpetuation of his social slavery. The Commune was therefore to serve as a lever for uprooting the economical foundations upon which rests the existence of classes, and therefore of class rule. With labour emancipated, every man becomes a working man, and productive labour ceases to be a class attribute.

It is a strange fact. In spite of all the tall talk and all the immense literature, for the last sixty years, about Emancipation of Labour, no sooner do the working men anywhere take the subject into their own hands with a will, than uprises at once all the apologetic phraseology of the mouthpieces of present society with its two poles of Capital and Wage-slavery (the landlord now is but the sleeping partner of the capitalist), as if capitalist society was still in its purest state of virgin innocence, with its antagonisms still undeveloped, with its delusions still unexploded, with its prostitute realities not yet laid bare. The Commune, they exclaim, intends to abolish property, the basis of all civilization! Yes, gentlemen, the Commune intended to abolish that class-property which makes the labour of the many the wealth of the few. It aimed at the expropriation of the expropriators. It wanted to make individual property a truth by transforming the means of production, land and capital, now chiefly the means of enslaving and exploiting labour, into mere instruments of free and associated labour. But this is Communism, "impossible" Communism! Why, those members of the ruling classes who are intelligent enough to perceive the impossibility of continuing the present

system—and they are many—have become the obtrusive and fullmouthed apostles of co-operative production. If co-operative production is not to remain a sham and a snare; if it is to supersede the Capitalist system; if united co-operative societies are to regulate national production upon a common plan, thus taking it under their own control, and putting an end to the constant anarchy and periodical convulsions which are the fatality of capitalist production—what else, gentlemen, would it be but Communism, "possible" Communism?

The working class did not expect miracles from the Commune. They have no ready-made utopias to introduce *par decret du peuple*. They know that in order to work out their own emancipation, and along with it that higher form to which present society is irresistibly tending, by its own economical agencies, they will have to pass through long struggles, through a series of historic processes, transforming circumstances and men. They have no ideals to realize, but to set free the elements of the new society with which old collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant. In the full consciousness of their historic mission, and with the heroic resolve to act up to it, the working class can afford to smile at the coarse invective of the gentlemen's gentlemen with the pen and inkhorn, and at the didactic patronage of well-wishing bourgeois-doctrinaires, pouring forth their ignorant platitudes and sectarian crochets in the oracular tone of scientific infallibility.

When the Paris Commune took the management of the revolution in its own hands; when plain working men for the first time dared to infringe upon the Governmental privilege of their "natural superiors," and, under circumstances of unexampled difficulty, performed their work modestly, conscientiously, and efficiently—performed it at salaries the highest of which barely amounted to one-fifth of what, according to high scientific authority, is the minimum required for a secretary to a certain metropolitan school board—the old world writhed in convulsions of rage at the sight of the Red Flag, the symbol of the Republic of Labour, floating over the Hotel de Ville.

And yet, this was the first revolution in which the working class was openly acknowledged as the only class capable of social initiative, even by the great bulk of the Paris middle-class—shop-keepers, tradesmen, merchants—the wealthy capitalist alone excepted. The Commune had saved them by a sagacious settlement of that ever recurring cause of dispute among the middle-class themselves—the debtor and creditor accounts. The same portion of the middle class, after they had assisted in putting down the working men's insurrection of June, 1848, had been at once unceremoniously sacrificed to their creditors by the then Constituent Assembly. But this was not their only motive for now rallying round the working class. They felt there was but one alternative—the Commune, or the Empire—under whatever name it might reappear. The Empire had ruined them economically by the havoc it made of public wealth, by the wholesale financial swindling it fostered, by the props it lent to the artificially accelerated centralization of capital, and the concomitant expropriation of their own ranks. It has suppressed them politically,

it had shocked them morally by its orgies, it had insulted their Voltairianism by handing over the education of their children to the *frères Ignorantins*,[1] it had revolted their national feeling as Frenchmen by precipitating them headlong into a war which left only one equivalent for the ruins it made—the disappearance of the Empire. In fact, after the exodus from Paris of the high Bonapartist and capitalist *Bohême*, the true middle class Party of Order came out in the shape of the "Union Republicaine," enrolling themselves under the colours of the Commune and defending it against the wilful misconstruction of Thiers. Whether the gratitude of this great body of the middle class will stand the present severe trial, time must show.

The Commune was perfectly right in telling the peasants that "its victory was their only hope." Of all the lies hatched at Versailles and re-echoed by the glorious European penny-a-liner, one of the most tremendous was that the Rurals represented the French peasantry. Think only of the love of the French peasant for the men to whom, after 1815, he had to pay the milliard of indemnity! In the eyes of the French peasant, the very existence of a great landed proprietary is in itself an encroachment on his conquests of 1789. The bourgeoisie, in 1848, had burdened his plot of land with the additional tax of forty-five cents. in the franc; but then he did so in the name of the revolution; while now he had fomented a civil war against the revolution, to shift on the peasant's shoulders the chief load of the five milliards of indemnity to be paid to the Prussians. The Commune, on the other hand, in one of its first proclamations, declared that the true originators of the war would be made to pay its cost. The Commune would have delivered the peasant of the blood tax, would have given him a cheap government, transformed his present blood-suckers, the notary, advocate, executor, and other judicial vampires, into salaried communal agents, elected by, and responsible to himself. It would have freed him of the tyranny of the *garde champetre*, the gendarme, and the prefect; would have put enlightenment by the schoolmaster in the place of stultification by the priest. And the French peasant is, above all, a man of reckoning. He would find it extremely reasonable that the pay of the priest, instead of being extorted by the tax-gatherer, should only depend upon the spontaneous action of the parishioners' religious instincts. Such were the great immediate boons which the rule of the Commune—and that rule alone—held out to the French peasantry. It is, therefore, quite superfluous here to expatiate upon the more complicated but vital problems which the Commune alone was able, and at the same time compelled, to solve in favour of the peasant, viz., the hypothecary debt, lying like an incubus upon his parcel of soil, the *proletariat foncier* (the rural proletariat), daily growing upon it, and his expropriation from it enforced, at a more and more rapid rate, by the very development of modern agriculture and the competition of capitalist farming.

The French peasant had elected Louis Bonaparte president of the Republic; but the Party of Order created the Empire. What the French peasant really wants he commenced to show in 1849 and 1850, by opposing his maire

[1] The Brothers of Ignorance.

to the Government's prefect, his schoolmaster to the Government's priest, and himself to the Government's gendarme. All the laws made by the party of order in January and February, 1850, were avowed measures of repression against the peasant. The peasant was a Bonapartist, because the great Revolution, with all its benefits to him, was, in his eyes, personified in Napoleon. This delusion, rapidly breaking down under the Second Empire (and in its very nature hostile to the Rurals), this prejudice of the past, how could it have withstood the appeal of the Commune to the living interests and urgent wants of the peasantry?

The Rurals—this was, in fact, their chief apprehension—knew that three months' free communication of Communal Paris with the provinces would bring about a general rising of the peasants, and hence their anxiety to establish a police blockade around Paris, so as to stop the spread of the rinderpest.

If the Commune was thus the true representative of all the healthy elements of French society, and therefore the truly national Government, it was, at the same time, a working men's Government, as the bold champion of the emancipation of labour, emphatically international. Within sight of the Prussian army, that had annexed to Germany two French provinces, the Commune annexed to France the working people all over the world.

The second Empire had been the jubilee of cosmopolitan blackleggism, the rakes of all countries rushing in at its call for a share in its orgies and in the plunder of the French people. Even at this moment the right hand of Thiers is Ganesco, the foul Wallachian, and his left hand is Markowski, the Russian spy. The Commune admitted all foreigners to the honour of dying for the immortal cause. Between the foreign war lost by their treason, and the civil war fomented by their conspiracy with the foreign invader, the bourgeoisie had found the time to display their patriotism by organising police-hunts upon the Germans in France. The Commune made a German working-man[1] its Minister of Labour, Thiers, the bourgeoisie, the Second Empire, had continually deluded Poland by loud professions of sympathy, while in reality betraying her to, and doing the dirty work of Russia. The Commune honored the heroic sons of Poland by placing them at the head of the defenders of Paris. And, to broadly mark the new era of history, it was conscious of initiating, under the eyes of the conquering Prussians on the one side and of the Bonapartist army, led by Bonapartist generals, on the other, the Commune pulled down that colossal symbol of martial glory, the Vendôme column.

The great social measure of the Commune was its own working existence. Its special measures could but betoken the tendency of a government of the people by the people. Such were the abolition of the nightwork of journeyman bakers; the prohibition, under penalty, of the employers' practice to reduce wages by levying upon their workpeople fines under manifold pretexts—a process in which the employer combines in his own person the parts of legislator, judge, and executioner, and filches the money to boot. Another

[1] An Austrian, Leo Frankel.

measure of this class was the surrender, to associations of workmen, under reserve of compensation, of all closed workshops and factories, no matter whether the respective capitalists had absconded or preferred to strike work

The financial measures of the Commune, remarkable for their sagacity and moderation, could only be such as were compatible with the state of a besieged town. Considering the colossal robberies committed upon the City of Paris by the great financial companies and contractors, under the protection of Haussmann, the Commune would have had an incomparably better title to confiscate their property than Louis Napoleon had against the Orleans family. The Hohenzollern and the English oligarchs, who both have derived a good deal of their estates from Church plunder, were, of course, greatly shocked at the Commune clearing but 8,000f. out of secularization.

While the Versailles Government, as soon as it had recovered some spirit and strength, used the most violent means against the Commune; while it put down the free expression of opinion all over France, even to the forbidding of meetings of delegates from the large towns; while it subjected Versailles and the rest of France to an espionage far surpassing that of the Second Empire; while it burned by its gendarme inquisitors all papers printed at Paris, and sifted all correspondence from and to Paris; while in the National Assembly the most timid attempts to put in a word for Paris were howled down in a manner unknown even to the *Chambre introuvable* of 1816; with the savage warfare of Versailles outside, and its attempts at corruption and conspiracy inside Paris—would the Commune not have shamefully betrayed its trust by affecting to keep up all the decencies and appearances of liberalism as in a time of profound peace? Had the Government of the Commune been akin to that of M. Thiers, there would have been no more occasion to suppress Party-of-Order papers at Paris than there was to suppress Communal papers at Versailles.

It was irritating, indeed, to the Rurals that at the very same time they declared the return to the Church to be the only means of salvation for France, the infidel Commune unearthed the peculiar mysteries of the Picpus nunnery and of the Church of St. Laurent. It was a satire upon M. Thiers that, while he showered grand crosses upon the Bonapartist generals, in acknowledgment of their mastery in losing battles, signing capitulations, and turning cigarettes at Wilhelmshohe, the Commune dismissed and arrested its generals whenever they were suspected of neglecting their duties. The expulsion from, and arrest by, the Commune of one of its members who had slipped in under a false name, and had undergone at Lyons six days' imprisonment for simple bankruptcy, was it not a deliberate insult hurled at the forger, Jules Favre, then still the Foreign Minister of France, still selling France to Bismarck, and still dictating his orders to that paragon Government of Belgium? But, indeed, the Commune did not pretend to infallibility, the invariable attribute of all governments of the old stamp. It published its doings and sayings, it initiated the public into all its shortcomings.

In every revolution there intrude, at the side of its true agents, men of a

different stamp; some of them survivors of and devotees to past revolutions, without insight into the present movement, but preserving popular influence by their known honesty and courage, or by the sheer force of tradition; others mere bawlers, who by dint of repeating year after year the same set of stereotyped declamation against the Government of the day, have sneaked into the reputation of revolutionists of the first water. After 18th of March, some such men did also turn up, and in some cases contrived to play pre-eminent parts. As far as their power went, they hampered the real action of the working-class, exactly as men of that sort have hampered the full development of every previous revolution. They are an unavoidable evil; with time they are shaken off; but time was not allowed to the Commune.

Wonderful, indeed, was the change the Commune had wrought in Paris! No longer any trace of the meretricious Paris of the Second Empire. No longer was Paris the rendezvous of British landlords, Irish absentees, American ex-slaveholders and shoddy men, Russian ex-serfowners, and Wallachian boyards. No more corpses at the Morgue, no nocturnal burglaries, scarcely any robberies; in fact, for the first time since the days of February, 1848, the streets of Paris were safe, and that without any police of any kind. "We," said a member of the Commune, "hear no longer of assassination, theft, and personal assault; it seems, indeed, as if the police had dragged along with it to Versailles all its Conservative friends." The *cocottes* had refound the scent of their protectors—the absconding men of family, religion, and, above all, of property. In their stead, the real women of Paris showed again at the surface —heroic, noble, and devoted, like the women of antiquity. Working, thinking, fighting, bleeding Paris—almost forgetful, in its incubation of a new society, of the cannibals at its gates—radiant in the enthusiasm of its historic initiative!

Opposed to this new world at Paris, behold the old world at Versailles—that assembly of the ghouls of all defunct *régimes*, Legitimists and Orleanists, eager to feed upon the carcass of the nation—with a tail of antediluvian Republicans, sanctioning, by their presence in the Assembly, the slaveholders' rebellion, relying for the maintenance of their Parliamentary Republic upon the vanity of the senile mountebank at its head, and caricaturing 1789 by holding their ghastly meetings in the *Jeu de Paume*.[1] There it was, this Assembly, the representative of everything dead in France, propped up by the semblance of life by nothing but the swords of the generals of Louis Bonaparte. Paris all truth, Versailles all lie; and that lie vented through the mouth of Thiers.

Thiers tells a deputation of the mayors of the Seine-et-Oise,—"You may rely upon my word, which I have *never* broken!" He tells the Assembly itself that "it was the most freely elected and most liberal Assembly France ever possessed"; he tells his motley soldiery that it was "the admiration of the world, and the finest army France ever possessed;" he tells the provinces that the bombardment of Paris by him was a myth: "If some cannon-shots have been

[1] Tennis Court, see p. 26.

fired, it is not the deed of the army of Versailles, but of some insurgents trying to make believe that they are fighting, while they dare not show their faces." He again tells the provinces that "the artillery of Versailles does not bombard Paris, but only cannonades it." He tells the Archbishop of Paris, that the pretended executions and reprisals (!) attributed to the Versailles troops were all moonshine. He tells Paris that he was only anxious "to free it from the hideous tyrants who oppress it," and that, in fact, the Paris of the Commune was "but a handful of criminals."

The Paris of M. Thiers was not the real Paris of the "vile multitude," but a phantom Paris, the Paris of the *francs-fileurs*, the Paris of the Boulevards, male and female—the rich, the capitalist, the gilded, the idle Paris now thronging with its lackeys, its blacklegs, its literary *bohême*, and its *cocottes* at Versailles, Saint-Denis, Rueil, and Saint-Germain; considering the civil war but an agreeable diversion, eyeing the battle going on through telescopes, counting the rounds of cannon, and swearing by their own honour and that of their prostitutes, that the performance was far better got up than it used to be at the Porte St. Martin. The men who fell were really dead; the cries of the wounded were cries in good earnest; and, besides, the whole thing was so intensely historical.

This is the Paris of M. Thiers, as the Emigration of Coblentz was the France of M. de Calonne.

IV.

THE first attempt of the slaveholders' conspiracy to put down Paris by getting the Prussians to occupy it, was frustrated by Bismarek's refusal. The second attempt, that of the 18th of March, ended in the rout of the army and the flight to Versailles of the Government, which ordered the whole administration to break up and follow in its track. By the semblance of peace-negotiations with Paris, Thiers found the time to prepare for war against it. But where to find an army? The remnants of the line regiments were weak in number and unsafe in character. His urgent appeal to the provinces to succour Versailles by their National Guards and volunteers, met with a flat refusal. Brittany alone furnished a handful of *Chouans* fighting under a white flag, every one of them wearing on his breast the heart of Jesus in white cloth, and shouting "Vive le Roi!" (Long live the King!). Thiers was, therefore, compelled to collect, in hot haste, a motley crew, composed of sailors, marines, Pontifical Zouaves, Valentin's gendarmes, and Pietri's *sergents de ville* and *mouchards*. This army, however, would have been ridiculously ineffective without the instalments of imperialist war-prisoners, which Bismarck granted in numbers just sufficient to keep the civil war a-going, and keep the Versailles Government in abject dependence on Prussia. During the war itself, the Versailles police had to look after the Versailles army, while the gendarmes had to drag it on by exposing themselves at all posts of danger. The forts which fell were not taken but bought. The heroism of the Federals convinced Thiers that the resistance of Paris was not to be broken by his own strategic genius and the bayonets at his disposal.

Meanwhile, his relations with the provinces became more and more difficult. Not one single address of approval came in to gladden Thiers and his Rurals. Quite the contrary. Deputations and addresses demanding, in a tone anything but respectful, conciliation with Paris on the basis of the unequivocal recognition of the Republic, the acknowledgment of the Communal liberties, and the dissolution of the National Assembly, whose mandate was extinct, poured in from all sides, and in such numbers that Dufaure, Thiers's Minister of Justice, in his circular of April 23rd to the public prosecutors, commanded them to treat "the cry of conciliation" as a crime. In regard, however, of the hopeless prospect held out by his campaign, Thiers resolved to shift his tactics by ordering, all over the country, municipal elections to take place on the 30th of April, on the basis of the new municipal law dictated by himself to the National Assembly. What with the intrigues of his prefects, what with police intimidation, he felt quite sanguine of imparting, by the verdict of the provinces, to the National Assembly that moral power it had never possessed, and of getting at last from the provinces the physical force required for the conquest of Paris.

His banditti-warfare against Paris, exalted in his own bulletins, and the attempts of his ministers at the establishment, throughout France, of a reign of terror, Thiers was from the beginning anxious to accompany with a little byplay of conciliation, which had to serve more than one purpose. It was to dupe the provinces, to inveigle the middle-class element in Paris, and, above all, to afford the professed Republicans in the National Assembly the opportunity of hiding their treason against Paris behind their faith in Thiers. On the 21st of March, when still without an army, he had declared to the Assembly: "Come what may, I will not send an army to Paris." On the 27th of March he rose again: "I have found the Republic an accomplished fact, and I am firmly resolved to maintain it." In reality, he put down the revolution at Lyons and Marseilles in the name of the Republic, while the roars of his Rurals drowned the very mention of its name at Versailles. After this exploit, he toned down the "accomplished fact" into an hypothetical fact. The Orleans princes, whom he had cautiously warned off Bordeaux, were now, in flagrant breach of the law, permitted to intrigue at Dreux. The concessions held out by Thiers in his interminable interviews with the delegates from Paris and the provinces, although constantly varied in tone and colour, according to time and circumstances, did in fact never come to more than the prospective restriction of revenge to the "handful of criminals implicated in the murder of Lecomte and Clement Thomas," on the well-understood premiss that Paris and France were unreservedly to accept M. Thiers himself as the best of possible Republics, as he, in 1830, had done with Louis Philippe. Even these concessions he not only took care to render doubtful by the official comments put upon them in the Assembly through his Ministers. He had his Dufaure to act. Dufaure, this old Orleanist lawyer, had always been the justiciary of the state of siege as now in 1871 under Thiers, so in 1839 under Louis Philippe, and in 1849 under Louis Bona-

parte's presidency. While out of office he made a fortune by pleading for the Paris capitalists, and made political capital by pleading against the laws he had himself originated. He now hurried through the National Assembly not only a set of repressive laws which were, after the fall of Paris, to extirpate the last remnants of Republican liberty in France; he foreshadowed the fate of Paris by abridging the, for him, too slow procedure of courts-martial, and by a new-fangled, Draconic code of deportation. The Revolution of 1848, abolishing the penalty of death for political crimes, had replaced it by deportation. Louis Bonaparte did not dare, at least not in theory, to re-establish the *régime* of the guillotine. The Rural Assembly, not yet bold enough even to hint that the Parisians were not rebels, but assassins, had therefore to confine its prospective vengeance against Paris to Dufaure's new code of deportation. Under all these circumstances Thiers himself could not have gone on with his comedy of conciliation, had it not, as he intended it to do, drawn forth shrieks of rage from the Rurals, whose ruminating mind did neither understand the play, nor its necessities of hypocrisy, tergiversation, and procrastination.

In sight of the impending municipal elections of the 30th April, Thiers enacted one of his great conciliation scenes on the 27th of April. Amidst a flood of sentimental rhetoric, he exclaimed from the tribune of the Assembly: "There exists no conspiracy against the Republic but that of Paris, which compels us to shed French blood. I repeat it again and again. Let those impious arms fall from the hands which hold them, and chastisement will be arrested at once by an act of peace excluding only the small number of criminals." To the violent interruption of the Rurals he replied: "Gentlemen, tell me, I implore you, am I wrong? Do you really regret that I could have stated the truth that the criminals are only a handful? Is it not fortunate in the midst of our misfortunes that those who have been capable to shed the blood of Clement Thomas and General Lecomte are but rare exceptions?"

France, however, turned a deaf ear to what Thiers flattered himself to be a parliamentary siren's song. Out of 700,000 municipal councillors returned by the 35,000 communes still left to France, the united Legitimists, Orleanists, and Bonapartists did not carry 8,000. The supplementary elections which followed were still more decidedly hostile. Thus, instead of getting from the provinces the badly-needed physical force, the National Assembly lost even its last claim of moral force, that of being the expression of the universal suffrage of the country. To complete the discomfiture, the newly-chosen municipal councils of all the cities of France openly threatened the usurping Assembly at Versailles with a counter Assembly at Bordeaux.

Then the long-expected moment of decisive action had at last come for Bismarck. He peremptorily summoned Thiers to send to Frankfort plenipotentiaries for the definite settlement of peace. In humble obedience to the call of his master, Thiers hastened to despatch his trusty Jules Favre, backed by Pouyer-Quertier. Pouyer-Quertier, an "eminent" Rouen cotton-spinner, a fervent and even servile partisan of the Second Empire, had never found any

fault with it save its commercial treaty with England, prejudicial to his own shop-interests. Hardly installed at Bordeaux as Thiers's Minister of Finance, he denounced that "unholy" treaty, hinted at its near abrogation, and had even the effrontery to try, although in vain (having counted without Bismarck), the immediate enforcement of the old protective duties against Alsace, where, he said, no previous international treaties stood in the way. This man, who considered counter-revolution as a means to put down wages at Rouen, and the surrender of French provinces as a means to bring up the price of his wares in France, was he not *the one* predestined to be picked out by Thiers as the helpmate of Jules Favre in his last and crowning treason?

On the arrival at Frankfort of this exquisite pair of plenipotentiaries, bully Bismarck at once met them with the imperious alternative. Either the restoration of the Empire, or the unconditional acceptance of my own peace terms! These terms included a shortening of the intervals in which the war indemnity was to be paid, and the continued occupation of the Paris forts by Prussian troops until Bismarck should feel satisfied with the state of things in France; Prussia thus being recognized as the supreme arbiter in internal French politics! In return for this he offered to let loose, for the extermination of Paris, the captive Bonapartist army, and to lend them the direct assistance of Emperor William's troops. He pledged his good faith by making payment of the first instalment of the indemnity dependent on the "pacification" of Paris. Such a bait was, of course, eagerly swallowed by Thiers and his plenipotentiaries. They signed the treaty of peace on the 10th of May, and had it endorsed by the Versailles Assembly on the 18th.

In the interval between the conclusion of peace and the arrival of the Bonapartist prisoners, Thiers felt more bound to resume his comedy of conciliation as his Republican tools stood in sore need of a pretext for blinking their eyes at the preparations for the carnage of Paris. As late as the 18th of May he replied to a deputation of middle-class conciliators—"Whenever the insurgents will make up their minds for capitulation, the gates of Paris shall be flung wide open during a week for all except the murderers of Generals Clement Thomas and Lecomte."

A few days afterwards, when violently interpellated on these promises by the Rurals, he refused to enter into any explanations; not, however, without giving them this significant hint:—"I tell you there are impatient men amongst you, men who are in too great a hurry. They must have another eight days; at the end of these eight days there will be no more danger, and the task will be proportionate to their courage and to their capacities." As soon as Mac Mahon was able to assure him that he could shortly enter Paris, Thiers declared to the Assembly that "he would enter Paris, with the *laws* in his hands, and demand a full expiation from the wretches who had sacrificed the lives of soldiers and destroyed public monuments." As the moment of decision drew near he said—to the Assembly, "I shall be pitiless!"—to Paris, that it was doomed; and to his Bonapartist banditti, that they had State licence

to wreak vengeance upon Paris to their heart's content. At last, when treachery had opened the gates of Paris to General Douai, on the 21st of May, Thiers, on the 22nd, revealed to the Rurals the "goal" of his conciliation comedy, which they had so obstinately persisted in not understanding. "I told you a few days ago that we were approaching *our goal:* to-day I came to tell you *the goal* is reached. The victory of order, justice, and civilization is at last won!"

So it was. The civilization and justice of bourgeois order comes out in its lurid light whenever the slaves and drudges of that order rise against their masters. Then this civilization and justice stand forth as undisguised savagery and lawless revenge. Each new crisis in the class struggle between the appropriator and the producer brings out this fact more glaringly. Even the atrocities of the bourgeois in June, 1848, vanish before the ineffable infamy of 1871. The self-sacrificing heroism with which the population of Paris—men, women, and children—fought for eight days after the entrance of the Versaillese, reflects as much the grandeur of their cause as the infernal deeds of the soldiery reflect the innate spirit of that civilization of which they are the mercenary vindicators. A glorious civilization, indeed, the great problem of which is how to get rid of the heaps of corpses it made after the battle was over!

To find a parallel for the conduct of Thiers and his bloodhounds we must go back to the times of Sulla and the two Triumvirates of Rome. The same wholesale slaughter in cold blood; the same disregard, in massacre, of age and sex, the same system of torturing prisoners; the same proscriptions, but this time of a whole class; the same savage hunt after concealed leaders, lest one might escape; the same denunciations of political and private enemies; the same indifference for the butchery of entire strangers to the feud. There is but this difference, that the Romans had no *mitrailleuses*[1] for the despatch, in the lump, of the proscribed, and that they had not "the law in their hands," nor on their lips the cry of "civilization."

And after those horrors, look upon the other, still more hideous, face of that bourgeois civilization as described by its own press!

"With stray shots," writes the Paris correspondent of a London Tory paper, "still ringing in the distance, and untended wounded wretches dying amid the tombstones of Pere la Chaise—with 6,000 terror-stricken insurgents wandering in an agony of despair in the labyrinth of the catacombs, and wretches hurried through the streets to be shot down in scores by the mitrailleuse—it is revolting to see the *cafés* filled with the votaries of absinthe, billiards, and dominoes; female profligacy perambulating the boulevards, and the sound of revelry disturbing the night from the *cabinets particuliers* of fashionable restaurants." M. Edouard Herve writes in the *Journal de Paris*, a Versaillist journal suppressed by the Commune:—"The way in which the population of Paris (!) manifested its satisfaction yesterday was rather more than frivolous, and we fear it will grow worse as time progresses. Paris has

[1] Machine-guns

now a *fête* day appearance, which is sadly out of place; and, unless we are to be called the *Parisiens de la décadence*, this sort of thing must come to an end." And then he quotes the passage from Tacitus:—"Yet, on the morrow of that horrible struggle, even before it was completely over, Rome—degraded and corrupt—began once more to wallow in the voluptuous slough which was destroying its body and polluting its soul—*ali prælia et vulnera, alibi balnea popinæque*—(here fights and wounds, there baths and restaurants)." M. Herve only forgets to say that the "population of Paris" he speaks of is but the population of the Paris of M. Thiers—the *francs-fileurs* returning in throngs from Versailles, Saint Denis, Rueil, and Saint Germain—*the* Paris of the "Decline."

In all its bloody triumphs over the self-sacrificing champions of a new and better society, that nefarious civilization, based upon the enslavement of labour, drowns the moans of its victims in a hue-and-cry of calumny, reverberated by a world-wide echo. The serene working men's Paris of the Commune is suddenly changed into a pandemonium by the bloodhounds of "order." And what does this tremendous change prove to the bourgeois mind of all countries? Why, that the Commune has conspired against civilization! The Paris people die enthusiastically for the Commune in numbers unequalled in any battle known to history What does that prove? Why, that the Commune was not the people's own government, but the usurpation of a handful of criminals! The women of Paris joyfully give up their lives at the barricades and on the place of execution. What does this prove? Why, that the demon of the Commune has changed them into Megæras and Hecates! The moderation of the Commune during two months of undisputed sway is equalled only by the heroism of its defence. What does that prove? Why, that for months the Commune carefully hid, under a mask of moderation and humanity, the bloodthirstiness of its fiendish instincts, to be let loose in the hour of its agony!

The working men's Paris, in the act of its heroic self-holocaust, involved in its flames buildings and monuments. While tearing to pieces the living body of the proletariat, its rulers must no longer expect to return triumphantly into the intact architecture of their abodes. The Government of Versailles cries, "Incendiarism!" and whispers this cue to all its agents, down to the remotest hamlet, to hunt up its enemies everywhere as suspect of professional incendiarism. The bourgeoisie of the whole world, which looks complacently upon the wholesale massacre after the battle, is convulsed by horror at the desecration of brick and mortar!

When governments give state-licences to their navies to "kill, *burn*, and destroy," is that a licence for incendiarism? When the British troops wantonly set fire to the Capitol at Washington and to the summer palace of the Chinese Emperor, was that incendiarism? When the Prussians, not for military reasons, but out of the mere spite of revenge, burned down, by the help of petroleum, towns like Chateaudun and innumerable villages, was that incendiarism? When Thiers, during six weeks, bombarded Paris, under the

pretext that he wanted to set fire to those houses only in which there were people, was that incendiarism? In war, fire is an arm as legitimate as any. Buildings held by the enemy are shelled to set them on fire. If their defenders have to retire, they themselves light the flames to prevent the attack from making use of the buildings. To be burned down has always been the inevitable fate of all buildings situated in the front of battle of all the regular armies of the world. But in the war of the enslaved against their enslavers, the only justifiable war in history, this is by no means to hold good! The Commune used fire strictly as a means of defence. They used it to stop up to the Versailles troops those long, straight avenues which Haussmann had expressly opened to artillery fire; they used it to cover their retreat, in the same way as the Versaillese, in their advance, used their shells, which destroyed at least as many buildings as the fire of the Commune. It is a matter of dispute, even now, which buildings were set fire to by the defence and which by the attack. And the defence resorted to fire only then, when the Versaillese troops had already commenced their wholesale murdering of prisoners. Besides, the Commune had, long before, given full public notice that, if driven to extremities, they would bury themselves under the ruins of Paris, and make Paris a second Moscow, as the Government of Defence, but only as a cloak for its treason, had promised to do. For this purpose Trochu had found them the petroleum. The Commune knew that its opponents cared nothing for the lives of the Paris people, but cared much for their own Paris buildings. And Thiers, on the other hand, had given them notice that he would be implacable in his vengeance. No sooner had he got his army ready on one side, and the Prussians shutting up the trap on the other, than he proclaimed: "I shall be pitiless! The expiation will be complete, and justice will be stern!" If the acts of the Paris working men were vandalism, it was the vandalism of defence in despair, not the vandalism of triumph, like that which the Christians perpetrated upon the really priceless art treasures of heathen antiquity; and even that vandalism has been justified by the historian as an unavoidable and comparatively trifling concomitant to the Titanic struggle between a new society arising and an old one breaking down. It was still less the vandalism of Haussmann, razing historic Paris to make place for the Paris of the sightseer!

But the execution by the Commune of the sixty-four hostages, with the Archbishop of Paris at their head! The bourgeoisie and its army in June, 1848, re-established a custom which had long disappeared from the practice of war—the shooting of their defenceless prisoners. This brutal custom has since been more or less strictly adhered to by the suppressors of all popular commotions in Europe and India; thus proving that it constitutes a real "progress of civilization"! On the other hand, the Prussians, in France, had re-established the practice of taking hostages—innocent men, who, with their lives, were to answer to them for the acts of others. When Thiers, as we have seen, from the very beginning of the conflict, enforced the humane practice of shooting down the Communal prisoners, the Commune, to

protect their lives, was obliged to resort to the Prussians' practice of securing hostages. The lives of the hostages had been forfeited over and over again by the continued shooting of prisoners on the part of the Versaillese. How could they be spared any longer after the carnage with which MacMahon's prætorians celebrated their entrance into Paris? Was even the last check upon the unscrupulous ferocity of bourgeois governments—the taking of hostages—to be made a mere sham of? The real murderer of Archbishop Darboy is Thiers. The Commune again and again had offered to exchange the archbishop, and ever so many priests in the bargain, against the single Blanqui, then in the hands of Thiers. Thiers obstinately refused. He knew that with Blanqui he would give to the Commune a head: while the archbishop would serve his purpose best in the shape of a corpse. Thiers acted upon the precedent of Cavaignac. How, in June, 1848, did not Cavaignac and his men of order raise shouts of horror by stigmatizing the insurgents as the assassins of Archbishop Affre! They knew perfectly well that the archbishop had been shot by the soldiers of order. M. Jacquemet, the archbishop's vicar-general, present on the spot, had immediately afterwards handed them in his evidence to that effect.

All this chorus of calumny, which the party of order never fail, in their orgies of blood, to raise against their victims, only proves that the bourgeois of our days considers himself the legitimate successor to the baron of old, who thought every weapon in his own hand fair against the plebeian, while in the hands of the plebeian a weapon of any kind constituted in itself a crime.

The conspiracy of the ruling class to break down the Revolution by a civil war carried on under the patronage of the foreign invader—a conspiracy which we have traced from the very 4th of September down to the entrance of MacMahon's prætorians through the gate of St. Cloud—culminated in the carnage of Paris. Bismarck gloats over the ruins of Paris, in which he saw perhaps the first instalment of that general destruction of great cities he had prayed for when still a simple Rural in the Prussian *Chambre introuvable* of 1849. He gloats over the cadavres of the Paris proletariate. For him this is not only the extermination of revolution, but the extinction of France, now decapitated in reality, and by the French Government itself. With the shallowness characteristic of all successful statesmen, he sees but the surface of this tremendous historic event. Whenever before has history exhibited the spectacle of a conqueror crowning his victory by turning into, not only the gendarme, but the hired bravo of the conquered Government? There existed no war between Prussia and the Commune of Paris. On the contrary, the Commune had accepted the peace preliminaries, and Prussia had announced her neutrality. Prussia was, therefore, no belligerent. She acted the part of a bravo, a cowardly bravo, because incurring no danger; a hired bravo, because stipulating beforehand the payment of her blood-money of 500 millions on the fall of Paris. And thus, at last, came out the true character of the war, ordained by Providence as a chastisement of godless and debauched France by pious and moral Germany! And this unparalleled breach of the law of nations,

even as understood by the old world lawyers, instead of arousing the "civilized" Governments of Europe to declare the felonious Prussian Government, the mere tool of the St. Petersburg Cabinet, an outlaw amongst nations, only incites them to consider whether the few victims who escape the double cordon around Paris are not to be given up to the hangman at Versailles!

That after the most tremendous war of modern times, the conquering and the conquered hosts should fraternize for the common massacre of the proletariate—this unparalleled event does indicate, not, as Bismarck thinks, the final repression of a new society upheaving, but the crumbling into dust of bourgeois society. The highest heroic effort of which old society is still capable is national war; and this is now proved to be a mere governmental humbug, intended to defer the struggle of the classes, and to be thrown aside as soon as that class struggle bursts out in civil war. Class rule is no longer able to disguise itself in a national uniform; the national Governments are *one* as against the proletariate!

After Whit-Sunday, 1871, there can be neither peace nor truce possible between the working men of France and the appropriators of their produce. The iron hand of a mercenary soldiery may keep for a time both classes tied down in common oppression. But the battle must break out again and again in ever-growing dimensions, and there can be no doubt as to who will be the victor in the end,—the appropriating few, or the immense working majority. And the French working class is only the advanced guard of the modern proletariate.

While the European Governments thus testify, before Paris, to the international character of class rule, they cry down the International Working Men's Association—the international counter-organization of labour against the cosmopolitan of capital—as the head fountain of all these disasters. Thiers denounced it as the despot of labour, pretending to be its liberator. Picard ordered that all communications between the French Internationals and those abroad should be cut off; Count Jaubet, Thiers's mummified accomplice of 1835, declares it the great problem of all civilized governments to weed it out. The Rurals roar against it, and the whole European press joins the chorus. An honourable French writer, completely foreign to our Association, speaks as follows:—"The members of the Central Committee of the National Guard, as well as the greater part of the members of the Commune, are the most active, intelligent, and energetic minds of the International Working Men's Association; . . . . men who are thoroughly honest, sincere, intelligent, devoted, pure, and fanatical in the *good* sense of the word." The police-tinged bourgeois mind naturally figures to itself the International Working Men's Association as acting in the manner of a secret conspiracy, its central body ordering, from time to time, explosions in different countries. Our Association is, in fact, nothing but the international bond between the most advanced working men in the various countries of the civilized world. Wherever, in whatever shape, and under whatever conditions the class struggle obtains any consistency, it is but natural that members

of our association should stand in the foreground. The soil out of which it grows is modern society itself. It cannot be stamped out by any amount of carnage. To stamp it out, the Government would have to stamp out the despotism of capital over labour—the condition of their own parasitical existence.

Working men's Paris, with its Commune, will be for ever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators history has already nailed to that eternal pillory from which all the prayers of their priest will not avail to redeem them.

THE GENERAL COUNCIL.

M. T. Boon, Fred. Bradnick, G. H. Buttery, Caihil, Wm. Hales, Kolb, Lessner, B. Lucraft,* George Milner, Thomas Mottershead, Charles Murray, George Odger,* Pfänder, Roach, Rühl, Sadler, Cowell Stepney, Alf. Taylor, Wm. Townshend.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARIES

EUGÈNE DUPONT, for France.
KARL MARX, for Germany and Holland.
FRED. ENGELS, for Belgium and Spain.
HERMANN JUNG, for Switzerland
P. GIOVACCHINI, for Italy.
ZÉVY MAURICE, for Hungary
ANTON ZABICKI, for Poland.
JAMES COHEN, for Denmark.
J. G. ECCARIUS, for the United States.

HERMANN JUNG, Chairman.
JOHN WESTON, Treasurer.
GEORGE HARRIS, Financial Secretary
JOHN HALES, General Secretary.

May 30th, 1871.

NOTES.[1]

"The column of prisoners halted in the Avenue Uhrich, and was drawn up, four or five deep, on the footway facing to the road. General Marquis de Gallifet and his staff dismounted and commenced an inspection from the left of the line. Walking down slowly and eyeing the ranks, the General stopped here and there, tapping a man on the shoulder or beckoning him out of the rear ranks. In most cases, without further parley, the individual thus selected was marched out into the centre of the road, where a small supplementary column was thus soon formed . . . It was evident that there was considerable room for error. A mounted officer pointed out to General Gallifet a man and woman for some particular offence. The woman, rushing out of the ranks, threw herself on her knees, and, with outstretched arms, protested her innocence in passionate terms. The general waited for a pause, and then with most impassible face and unmoved demeanour, said, 'Madame,

* Resigned as a protest against the publication of the *Civil War*.
[1] In the original.

I have visited every theatre in Paris, your acting will have no effect on me' (ce n'est pas la peine de jouer la comedie) . . . . It was not a good thing on that day to be noticeably taller, dirtier, cleaner, older, or uglier than one's neighbours. One individual in particular struck me as probably owing his speedy release from the ills of this world to his having a broken nose. . . . Over a hundred being thus chosen, a firing party told off, and the column resumed its march, leaving them behind. A few minutes afterwards a dropping fire in our rear commenced, and continued for over a quarter of an hour. It was the execution of these summarily-convicted wretches."—PARIS CORRESPONDENT "DAILY NEWS," June 8th.—This Gallifet, "the kept man of his wife, so notorious for her shameless exhibitions at the orgies of the Second Empire," went, during the war, by the name of the French "Ensign Pistol."

"The TEMPS, which is a careful journal, and not given to sensation, tells a dreadful story of people imperfectly shot and buried before life was extinct. A great number were buried in the Square round St. Jaques-la-Bouchiere; some of them very superficially. In the daytime the roar of the busy streets prevented any notice being taken; but in the stillness of the night the inhabitants of the houses in the neighbourhood were roused by distant moans, and in the morning a clenched hand was seen protruding through the soil. In consequence of this, exhumations were ordered to take place . . . . That many wounded have been buried alive I have not the slightest doubt. One case I can vouch for. When Brunel was shot with his mistress on the 24th ult. in the courtyard of a house in the Place Vendome, the bodies lay there until the afternoon of the 27th. When the burial party came to remove the corpses, they found the woman living still, and took her to an ambulance. Though she had received four bullets she is now out of danger."—PARIS CORRESPONDENT "EVENING STANDARD," June 8th.

Chapter VI

The Russian Revolution of 1905

Russia 1905-1906

143	Petition of the Workers to the Tsar January 22	1905
144	Gapon's Letter After the Massacre, January 22	1905
145	Resolution of the Social Democratic Party, January 23	1905
146	Resolution of the St. Petersburg Advocates, January 23	1905
147	Resolution of the Novgorod Zemstvo, January	1905
148	The Message of the Holy Synod, January 27	1905
149	The Message of the Tsar, February 1	1905
150	Leon Trotsky: *The Events in St. Petersburg*, February 2	1905
151	(A) Announcement of the Execution of the Grand Duke Sergius by the Organisation of Combat, February 18	1905
	(B) Defence of the Act, by the Moscow Social Revolutionaries, February 18	1905
152	From the Tsar's Manifestoes of March 3	1905
153	Black Hundred Manifestoes, April and May	1905
154	First Programme of the Peasants' Union, May	1905
155	Resolution of the June Congress of the Lettish Social Democrats	1905
156	Manifesto of the Rebel Sailors in the Black Sea, June 27	1905
157	Resolution at the Foundation of the Petrovsk Branch of the Peasants' Union, July	1905
158	Reports to the Congress of the Peasants' Union, July 31	1905
159	Resolution of the All-Russia Zemstvo Congress, September 25	1905
160	Orthodox Pogrom Circular, October	1905
161	Minutes of the St. Petersburg Soviet during the Second General Strike, November 14 to 19	1905
162	Resolution passed simultaneously all over Lettonia, November	1905
163	Declaration of the Khvalinshin Peasants upon the Terror, November 18	1905
164	First Common Manifesto of the Russian Socialist Parties, December 13	1905
165	"Appeal to the Civilised World" by the Lettish Social Democratic Union, May	1906
166	The Viborg Manifesto, July 23	1906

Introduction

IT is impossible to give a detailed account of the Russian Revolution of 1905. The area covered is too vast; it is greater than all the rest of Europe put together, and includes more nationalities, each of which has its individual revolutionary story. The Poles and Finns, the Letts and the Ruthenes, have each a very distinctive and interesting history during this period, but, unfortunately, the materials are not available, nor if they were could they be compressed into a reasonable space. Thus we shall have to confine ourselves to a general view of the Russian Revolution and only select documents and recount incidents which are typical of the whole country.

Russia in 1905 was under a despot, Nicholas II. Theoretically, his power was absolute. But as no despot, however strong—and Nicholas was timid and feeble to a degree—can hold his power unsupported, the real rulers of Russia were the nobility or governing class, divided into two portions—the huge landowners, headed by the Grand Dukes, and the bureaucracy. The Council of State was exclusively drawn from the nobility. The bureaucracy, which was immense, corrupt, and centralised to the last degree, was also drawn from the nobility, which directed Russian affairs purely in its own interest.

The ordinary psychology of the Russian noble is well known to us from the excellent translations of Russian fiction which have recently appeared. His mentality was that of a French noble of the *ancien régime*. St. Petersburg, on the one hand, was the scene of his polished, luxurious and brilliant depravity. This was the face he turned to the world. But his expensive vices were paid for by the most ruthless exploitation of the peasant. The peasants, in spite of the Liberation of 1861, he regarded as essentially his serfs, and treated them with the utmost cruelty A feudal relation supported by the Orthodox Church was the only society he could conceive, and one whose preservation he and his class were attempting to enforce upon Russia. Their theorist was K. Pobiedonostsev, Procurator of the Holy Synod and sometime tutor of the Tsar, who preached the usual antithesis between holy, simple and despotic Russia and the corrupt and immoral Western democracies.

This happy dream was broken by purely mundane causes. Contact with Western Europe since 1870 had undermined the foundations of their society. Foreign and Russian capital were transforming the face of the country and the feudal society was crumbling. Recognising his power as a disruptive force, the real reactionary hated worst of all the Liberal capitalist, and would proceed to extreme lengths to harass him. For example, in direct antagonism to the general policy, these feelings led to the formation of Government-inspired Trade Unions, organised by a police agent named Zubatov, just before the year 1900, and the outbreak of 1905 was due to a similar "kept" Union. These activities were undertaken largely out of pure spite against the manufacturers, although there may have been the side-motive of keeping the

workers "out of bad hands"—*i.e.*, revolutionary organisations. It was this question of the attitude to be taken up towards industry that divided Russian official circles into Liberals and reactionaries. A Liberal official was one who believed that it was wisest to encourage and conciliate the capitalist. A reactionary was one who would extirpate all taints of modern civilisation and return to the old Tsarist *régime* of before Peter the Great. The importance of the close of the Revolution is that then Peter Stolypin definitely eliminated the latter class of backwoodsmen from the governing councils and brought about an alliance between land and industry.

As, however, the invasion of modern ideas and modern capital continued, and the development of industry was even accelerated by Count Witte, for financial reasons, the main attention of the bureaucracy and more especially of the terrible police, was directed to keeping the workers and peasants down. For this purpose there was perfected a *régime* of horrible repression and deliberate brutalisation which is almost certainly unique in the world's history. Russian Tsarism never became civilised. From the days of Ivan the Terrible to the days of Alexander I, who ordered a Cossack to throw himself from the ramparts of a fortress in order to impress Napoleon, its relation to the Russian people had not altered. The incursion of European thought merely induced it to spread and make more violent its repression. The pioneers of the Socialist movement, as in Germany, were the students, and they suffered the full brunt of its tyranny. The thousands that Tsarism slew, or drove to a horrible death in the Siberian mines, will never be counted. To hold the common faith of an English Liberal was a crime. The gentlest and quietest thinkers were treated with a brutality and savagery which passes our Western comprehension. To read through the files of the publications of the various European Committees to assist the Russians, is to gain an impression of a nightmare of pointless and ignorant brutality, which makes one wonder how any remnants of civilisation remained.

To persecute out of existence, however, all independence or honesty of thought among the youth, was not sufficient. The balance sheet against the Tsar contained another and heavier item—the brutalisation of the common people. This was perhaps only brought to its maturity under Nicholas II. The trade of vodka, whose nationalisation under Alexander had been meant as an aid to sobriety, was used as a political means of debasing the peasant and urging him to "pogroms" (massacres). These pogroms were deliberately organised and incited by the authorities, sometimes directly, through the police, sometimes by means of "kept" Russian societies. The signal would be given through the police, and on a certain day the worst elements in the populace—hooligans, thieves and prostitutes—would rise and massacre and pillage the Jews, the students, or any suspected of Liberal opinions. Prince Urusov, in the First Duma, who had himself been in the Ministry of the Interior and vainly attempted to stop the organisation of pogroms, gave proofs of Government complicity which force us to regard the massacres as official operations as formal and regulated as the movements of the army.

Frequently, however, the police was not used directly, but the aid of various "patriotic" Russian societies, or Black Hundreds, was invoked. These had such titles as "The Union of the Russian Land," and had as ostensible purposes the recall of Russia to her old mediæval life and the expulsion of all Jews and Socialists. In fact they were merely subsidised organisations of hooligans who practised assassination and spread incitements to murder. Their formation was due to the growing enlightenment of the people, which made it difficult to induce them to massacre Jews and Liberals. One of their leaders, Krushevan, was the most notorious for his power in organising pogroms. It should be noted that the Tsar himself wore the button of the most powerful and villainous—the "League of Russian Men." Sufficient examples of their proclamations are given later (Nos. 153 and 160).

Thus the Tsarist bureaucracy hoped, in the interests of its own safety, to reduce the workers and peasants to complete brutality by poisoning their bodies with alcohol and their minds by organised and licensed pillage and murder. In this it had one other ally—the army. It was a conscript army, in which the peasant was drilled to dog-like submission by a separate class of officers. "Punitive expeditions" taught the soldiers the brutality which the officers had already learnt. It is noteworthy that the formation of the military officers' caste gave rise to a great increase in refined brutality to prisoners, especially women—torture and violation became more common.[1]

The condition of the Russian peasantry can only be compared to that of the French in 1789. It was a condition of chronic starvation. The worst suffering dates from 1861, the date of the liberation of the serfs. The landlords were assigned very heavy sums as recompense, which were extracted from the peasant in instalments. They were so great that the payments were still continuing in 1905 and there seemed no reason why they should ever cease. In addition, the lords reoccupied large portions of land which had been cultivated by the peasants, leaving them only the merest strip. By this means the peasants lost 1,350,000 dessiatins.[2] In Little Russia 29 per cent. of the land was taken from them. Out of 398,000,000 dessiatins the peasants owned 138,000,000 —one-third. Two-thirds of the land, that is, was owned by the landlords, the Church or the Tsar. With the increase of population the congestion became appalling. Thus, from 1890 to 1900 there were 547 dessiatins per 1,000 peasants—one-half dessiatin each. Land could only be leased at extortionate prices—45 roubles in 1888, in 1903 93 roubles.

Comparatively good was the condition of Courland, one of the richest provinces. Of 2,430,000 dessiatins of agricultural land nearly a million (980,000) were occupied by the nobility, another half-million and more by the Government, and 898,000 dessiatins were left to the peasantry, divided among 30,000 owners. The nobility's territory was owned by 463 persons; 400,000 peasants were without land at all.

Such land as the peasant did hold in Russia proper was held in common. The owner of it was the "Mir," the famous Russian Commune, headed by an

[1] The case of Marie Spiridonova will be in particular remembered.
[2] 1 dessiatin=2.7 acres.

elective chief, the "starosta." But the officials not infrequently interfered with the selection of the starosta and the Commune was in daily dread of them. The "Mir" system, however, made the Commune into a self-contained unit, which acted as one and taught the peasant solidarity. Almost all the Russian peasant revolts in 1905-6 were those of Communes acting *en masse*. On the other hand, it was an extremely wasteful method of cultivation. The land was divided up into long strips, in order that no peasant should have any advantage over another. These were cultivated separately and in the most antiquated and incompetent way. There was no co-operative cultivation. The land was not ploughed, owing to the price of iron, but merely scratched. It was re-divided at stated periods, so that improvements to one's own allotment were, more or less, wasted. The contention of the Liberals that this form of organisation had been artificially protected by the reactionaries was undoubtedly true. While the complete lack of education or wealth led to an ignorant method of cultivation which exhausted the soil, the huge estates of the landowners, whose produce ruled the price of corn, were cultivated on the latest scientific methods, and the peasant could not possibly compete. Famine becomes chronic in grain-producing districts after 1890.[1]

The interference by the Government only worsened matters. The vast bureaucracy which the Government had to keep up was paid for almost entirely by the peasant. Witte, intending among other objects to avoid any chance of passive resistance, had reduced direct taxation to a minimum, and made heavy increases in indirect taxation. Any luxury, or even necessity, which the peasant began to use was loaded with fresh taxation—notably, matches, tea, petroleum and iron. The last was a terrible privation, because it meant that all agriculture had to be carried on with wooden ploughshares. It was calculated that the Russian peasant, as compared with the German, paid two and a-half times as much for cotton and sugar, four and a-half times as much for iron, six times as much for coal. Such indirect taxation, while it affected the nobles very little, was calculated to reduce the peasant to a life little better than an animal's.

In addition to the ordinary hierarchy of officials, there was a separate and extraordinary official specially created to keep an eye on the peasant—the Land Captain. Nominally, he was an officer of the law, taking the place of the Justices of the Peace, who had proved too efficient and honest. But he was instructed not to abide by the law in his decisions, but by common sense. He was appointed by the Ministry of the Interior (not of Justice), and interfered in the most trivial matters, even family squabbles. He had the power to imprison at discretion and without trial. His duty was, in fact, to keep the peasant under a detailed and daily supervision, and there are many complaints of his oppression, corruption and cruelty.

Besides the lord's bailiff and the Government official, the peasant had another more insidious enemy, his "pope"-priest of the Greek Orthodox Church. The Greek Church is often spoken of as the most degraded type of

[1] Owing to Witte's bounty on export corn, the landowners of one province could export corn to Western Europe while there was famine in the next province or even their own.

Christianity. It is, at least, certain that the religion inculcated by the average priest was merely the observance of formalities and a belief in superstitions entirely divorced from any moral instruction. Certain priests were an honourable exception, but most acted as the advance guard of the blackest reaction. They were so ignorant that Pobiedonostsev's attempt to put them in charge of education failed because they had nothing to teach, but they managed to hold down the peasant in a state of superstition and ignorance even darker than their own During the Revolution priests led the riots and instigated murders of Jews and students, often, as in Volhynia, deliberately and painfully exciting massacres by means of hooligans. Their action in suppressing all independent thought by the peasant was made easier by their privileged position: they were spiritual Land Captains. The Church itself, with the monasteries, was a very wealthy landowner, whose flock of true believers was in fact, though not ostensibly, rapidly dwindling. In many respects it may be compared to the French Church in 1789.

In the foreign dependencies of Russia—Poland, the Baltic provinces, etc.—the chief differences were the absence of the firmly rooted village community and the presence of a strong nationalist feeling, which brought them to the point of revolutionary activity before the Russian peasant had begun to move.

The detailed machinery for the oppression of the Russian peasant had this fault. It was perfect in its repressive qualities, but it had no device for staving off the day when the growing misery of the peasant would make it less intolerable to resist than to suffer further exploitation. This day was hastened by the propaganda of the Social Revolutionary Party, which was brought to the countryside, firstly, by the patient toil of students and revolutionaries who went out to work among the peasants; secondly, by the "Go-aways," peasants who had been forced to go to the towns for work. These remained linked to their Commune in every way and were still classed in the same "volost" (the smallest administrative division). They formed as it were a semi-proletariat. In the towns they acted as the unskilled labourers—the skilled labourers alone forming a proletariat as we know it, entirely divorced from the land. They returned every year to village agriculture and there became the poorer section of the peasants. Thus they were very difficult to awaken to class-consciousness; but once converted they quickly carried Socialism to the villages.

In the towns they found almost a different civilisation. The old feudal relations had been but slightly changed in the country by the "Liberation" of 1861. The Government official took the place of the lord. The peasant was further impoverished. Otherwise there was little difference. In the towns, however, the Liberation changed serfs into potential working men and greatly facilitated the growth of a town proletariat. Between 1870 and 1880 there was a large importation of foreign capital and great industrial expansion. The inevitable result came in a trade depression from 1880 to 1887. Wages fell very sharply. In St. Petersburg many factories discharged half their employees, in Chernigov and Kostroma two-thirds. Two thirds of the Vladimir silk factories stopped work. This led to strikes, and the Imperial Government

woke up to the fact that an industrial proletariat had come into being. For the moment the police settled the strikes by imprisoning the strike leaders; when the crisis was over, the Government bestirred itself so far as to enact some factory laws, which remained dead letters, and, further, to forbid all trade unions and strikes. The Russian working man, especially in Moscow and other centres controlled by Russian capitalists, was at almost as low a level as the coolie.

From 1887 to 1900 trade revived again. In the first few years expansion was slow, but from 1895 onwards factories sprang up and business spread with a vertiginous rapidity. South Russia in particular was deeply altered. Huge factories were erected with the very latest modern machinery, requiring a large and thoroughly industrialised proletariat. This was made possible by the increase of the railway system and the exploitation of new coal and iron deposits. Count Witte, who was in supreme control from 1892 to 1903, was not satisfied with the pace of development and continually urged it on. Indeed, during this decade Russia changed from a semi-feudal country into a modern capitalist society. The sudden collapse of industry in 1900 turned out to be only a temporary crisis of the ordinary kind, and did not affect industry permanently. This great development, of course, benefited chiefly Russian and foreign capitalists.[1] The standard of the working-class life remained very low: nearly as low as that of the starving peasant. Strikes remained illegal: strike leaders were imprisoned or hanged. Sanitary legislation and factory acts were, for practical purposes, non-existent. Where foreign capital was predominant, as in St. Petersburg, the demand for "efficiency" meant that care was taken of the skilled workers. Elsewhere the conditions were terrible. Trade Unions, until the police began to found them in the interests of reaction, were illegal and rigorously suppressed. The Russians, however, had learnt in a hard school the lesson of secret combination, and the violence of the police could not prevent an epidemic of severe strikes in 1902 and again in 1903. In this latter case, the strike at Baku was the most formidable. After a murderous attack by the police, the strikers fired the oil-wells. "They shall be our candles for the dead," they said. The Baku workers paid heavily for their contumacy in the next two years.

This *régime* of official violence had not even the support of the bourgeoisie. Russia was as yet only half exploited.

There were vast territories of great wealth waiting for the enterprising capitalist. The ideal, therefore, of the bourgeois Liberal and the bourgeois Cadet Party, was, if possible, to secure a political Republic similar to the United States of America, where personal liberty and the absence of official control should be absolute. They truthfully complained that there was much wealth in Russia and Siberia which was wasted merely owing to the sullen stupidity of the officials. The more enlightened among them pointed out that the official *régime* prevented the worker rising much above the level of a

[1] Even up to 1914 Russia remained a land of gold for the capitalists. The syndicates in the Don region, which controlled the iron mines and smelting works, paid from 1912 to 1914 an average profit of 32 per cent. Two-thirds of the capital was owned in France and Belgium.

savage, and certainly prevented him from being an efficient factory hand. This, in its turn, discouraged the importation of foreign capital. The bureaucracy, they complained, was entirely under the control of feudal reactionaries. It interfered in industry in a detailed and inquisitive manner which recalled Germany, but it had not the excuse of German efficiency, being corrupt, incompetent, and indolent. Essential State services were in a condition of permanent disrepair. If only the bureaucracy could be removed, there was no limit to the possibilities of the successful exploitation of Russia.

Thus, the growing bourgeois class was almost entirely in opposition to Tsarism. It formed a constitutional party of varying degrees of Liberalism, from the Octobrists, who would like reform if the Tsar did not mind, to the Cadets, whose Left wing was very nearly revolutionary. Yet, as a whole, it had not the strength to be revolutionary. Modern industry had entered Russia in a very advanced form, and the prevailing type of factory was large. The bourgeoisie was faced with a proletariat which was numerically remarkably its superior and potentially an excellent instrument of a proletarian revolution. There was not the great and widespread small manufacturing class, which is the only possible instrument of a bourgeois revolution, as in 1848. Thus, in view of their numerical weakness and their fear of Socialism, the real policy of the capitalist class was to bully or cajole the ruling caste into taking them into partnership, and this they realised, except when some especial stupidity stung them to violent words.

The organs of their political expression were the Zemstvos, or County Councils. These assemblies were very heavily weighted with nobles, but the nobility were not entirely untouched by the Liberal movement, and in the towns bourgeois opinion practically always predominated. During this short revolutionary period, the Zemstvos may be regarded as the indices of bourgeois opinion. At the height of the Revolution they became Cadet. After Stolypin had conciliated capitalism, they became reactionary. Their avowed policy, formulated by Miliukov himself, may be summarised thus: to permit the disorders to grow, refusing to condemn them, until such time as they became too violent for the Tsar to control, and he had to call in their nominees to repress them. The plan has a familiar Girondin ring, but it was really very hazardous. They were counting upon the proletarian revolution going far enough to bring them to power and then collapsing in front of their resistance. This characteristic political finesse was attempted by Miliukov in 1917, with singularly little success.

The proletariat, that new force with which the bourgeoisie uneasily threatened the Government, possessed only two class-conscious organisations of importance—the Social Democratic Party and the Social Revolutionary Party. These were sub-divided. The former was divided into Mensheviki (Minority) and Bolsheviki (Majority). The disagreement was entirely on the question of working with the non-Socialist parties, which the Bolsheviki refused to do. But as yet the rift was very small: the quarrel in 1905 is not between Menshevik and Bolshevik, but between "S. R." and

"S. D." Both S. D. sections prided themselves upon their punctiliously exact Marxism: they felt themselves to be the worthy children of the First International, though their inspiration came not from the "Communist Manifesto," but from *Das Kapital*. The division between the sections seemed small and irritating: nobody expected it to last, and people were eagerly seeking a reunion. None was more indefatigable in this than Leon Trotsky. The strength of this Party lay in the towns exclusively: it expected the Revolution to come through the action of the town proletariat, and treated the peasant as a survival doomed to extinction. It was not terrorist. It was only five years old at the time of the Revolution, but was easily the most powerful party in the towns.

Their only serious rivals were the Social Revolutionaries. These were not, however, "Revisionists" in the ordinary sense. They represented a more indigenous Russian growth. They were non-Marxist, and their chief ground of difference was the rural question. According to orthodox Marxism, the Russian peasant commune was doomed, and Russia had to pass through the whole process of capitalist exploitation. The Social Revolutionaries denied this, and consequently spent much time in attacking the Marxian theory of the concentration of capital, at any rate as regards agriculture. They formed particularly the party of the peasant revolutionaries and desired to use the Mir as the basis of Socialism. The uncertainty and fluid character of their doctrines left room in their ranks for many doubtful Socialists: Mr. Pares[1] praises them by saying that under ordinary circumstances many "might have been Radicals." None the less, their revolutionary character is undeniable. They had a network of patient and obscure revolutionary agitators in the villages who were responsible for much of the peasant revolts in this period. They also had a terrorist organisation, called the Organisation of Combat (see No. 151), which executed official criminals.[2] This ceased operations during the First Duma's session.

In addition to these, which were Russian organisations, each of the many subject nations had their own organisations, which in many cases (*e.g.*, in Lettland) reflected the same divisions. Among these must be counted the oldest existing Russian Socialist Party, the Jewish "Bund," which, however, only dates from 1892.

The outbreak of the Russo-Japanese war in 1904, which was the immediate cause of the Revolution, had at the moment a detrimental effect upon it. It scattered the revolutionary nuclei and destroyed the circles of enlightened peasants and workers that had been so hardly built up. But this effect was speedily outweighed by another. The war was nakedly selfish, on both sides, being about a railway concession in a country (Manchuria) which belonged to neither. It offended the susceptibilities of the peasant, while at the same time each conscript torn from the villages meant that the peasant was faced with

[1] *Cambridge Modern History*, xii, p. 333.

[2] Later, after the destruction of the First Duma, terrorism was revived by an S.R. section called the "Maximalists," who later became identified with the "Left S.R.'s." of 1918. ("Minimalist" is not a word at all, but a journalist invention. It is possible to understand a party having a name which says it will take "as much as it can get," but not one that says it will take "as little as it can get".)

ruin. A sudden shrinkage of trade took place, and very soon the town workers were faced with unprecedented unemployment. In addition, the conduct of the war showed up the amazing incompetence of the Russian bureaucracy. Munitions and provisions were liberally provided on paper and many exorbitant contracts agreed to, but each peculating official on the Siberian railroad took his share and the army was continually lacking the most elementary needs. Supplies bought for the Red Cross by charitable subscription were publicly sold in Moscow, and a merchant who ventured to protest was punished. The Zemstvos, which attempted to provide efficient supplementary organisations, were deliberately thwarted and insulted. The most innocuous services—as, for example, a society to provide the soldiers with harmless literature, presided over by a Prince—were suppressed without any explanation. This produced very swiftly a decline of "patriotic sentiment" in favour of the war. On top of this came the inevitable result of official incompetence—a series of severe defeats at the hands of the Japanese. These not only damaged the Tsar's prestige and power, but threatened his Government with bankruptcy.

In Russia itself the bourgeoisie were severely hit by the war. Trade, except in certain industries needed for the war, shrank very considerably and suddenly. The railway service at the same time became more infrequent and inefficient. Unemployment became very great in the towns. In the four months ending June, 1904, 10,000 railwaymen had been discharged and the general increase of unemployment was estimated at between 300,000 and 400,000. The Government attempted to meet the extreme discontent by an increase of the White Terror, and by ignoring the demand of the bourgeoisie for a reasonably efficient and economical Government. This was answered by a recrudescence of terrorist justice. The Vice-Governor of Elizabetpol was executed at Agdshakent on July 17 and on July 28 the centre and organiser of the governmental terror, von Plehve, was executed in St. Petersburg, by a terrorist bomb. His death was a severe blow, and his place (at the Ministry of the Interior) was not filled for over a month. Bobrikov, Governor-General of Finland, had already been executed by Schauman on June 16, and Colonel Boguslavsky, Administrator of Surmalin (Caucasus) was slain at Igdir on August 1. The bourgeois Liberals themselves refused to condemn these and other executions.

The news of a serious and possibly fatal defeat at Liao-Yang brought home to the Tsar the fact that his Government was without any support outside the army, that even the army would not fight, and that his finances were in grave disorder. An attempt, therefore, was made to conciliate the Liberals and split the revolutionary forces. Prince Sviatopolk Mirsky, who was credited with "Liberal" views, was summoned on September 8 to take von Plehve's place. In the meantime the dislocation of trade, unemployment and suffering were growing worse each day.

The attempt to gain bourgeois confidence by the appointment of Mirsky failed very quickly. The Zemstvos were not to be satisfied with anything less

than the grant of responsible government in some form or other. Their supporters might, perhaps, have been conciliated by a radical reform of the administration and judiciary. But neither of these were in Prince Mirsky's power. The Tsar was determined to remain an autocrat, and Mirsky was the servant and not the master of the bureaucracy. No reply—or as in the case of Tver, a direct insult—was given to the Zemstvos which sent in addresses demanding a Constitution. The Congress of Delegates of Provincial Zemstvos (November 25) had to meet secretly. It forwarded a petition on the usual Liberal lines, requesting a constitution, and many hopes were pinned upon it. The Russian armies had met with a further and irreparable defeat at Sha Ho and the Liberals were openly calculating that the Tsar would not have enough force to resist them. The reply came in an unyielding Manifesto of the Government on December 27, refusing to impair autocracy in any degree. It also promised to arrange for a State insurance and some religious liberty. Instantly (December 30) the Moscow and Chernigov Zemstvos rejected the concession, in which action they were followed by practically the whole of Liberal opinion, and adjourned *sine die*. This act marks the definite failure of the Government attempt to secure the support of the bourgeoisie.[1]

It was, however, obvious that the Liberals were not willing or capable enough to carry out a revolution. This depended upon the working men, and until they moved the Tsar's Government was unattackable, in spite of the fall of Port Arthur, which removed the last hope of success in the Far East. The isolated and sporadic revolt of Socialist proletarians was turned into a vehement and unanimous revolt of the workers by the action of the Government itself. A certain clergyman, Father Gapon, had been since 1904 organising an Association of Factory Workers, under the direction of the police. Gapon himself was probably not an agent-provocateur, but merely a simple-minded priest. In any case, the officials were playing with fire. On January 15 a great strike, involving 13,200 people, broke out at the Putilov works, St. Petersburg. Gapon's Association, which conducted it—for the officials were not entirely averse to strikes on economic matters, since both employers and employees were potential enemies—presented certain purely economic demands—an eight-hour day, higher wages, recognition, etc. The employers refused even to meet delegates. The strike spread, but they remained obstinate. Eventually Gapon decided that the strikers should present a petition to the Tsar on January 22.[2]

This petition (No. 143) is a perfect index to the mind of the average Russian worker outside the Socialist parties. We can observe in it a very noticeable strain of the old Russian servility to the Tsar and pathetic trust in

[1] The earlier part of Mirsky's administration, which brought a slackening of the censorship and a large increase of "Liberal activities"—Zemstvo resolutions, etc.—together with a certain number of appointments of Liberal officials, was given the name of the "Spring." It had a considerable effect in preparing the Revolution, owing almost entirely to the relaxation of the censorship.

[2] The analysis of this important period, the birthday of the Revolution, differs in some respects from Trotsky's important and able account (No. 150). The reader must, of course, refer to that, but it seems undeniable that the revolutionaries all through this period held an exaggerated idea of the power of Socialist ideals among the Russian proletariat. It will be observed that Trotsky's essay outlined the very programme which he and Khrustalev, second and first Presidents of the St. Petersburg Soviet respectively, carried out in October and November.

him. There is an almost Oriental abasement in the last few words. On the other hand, the body of the petition throbs with a new spirit of indignation, primarily against the employers. But the Russian workers who presented the petition had progressed farther. They had been forced to recognise the necessity for political reforms. Therefore, there is inserted a list of reforms which are taken rather at haphazard from the Liberal programmes. Thus, the Russian "loyal" workers were convinced of the fact of their oppression, of their need for political liberty, but were unable to believe that the Tsar was opposing them.

Their awakening was terrible. When the immense procession of workers, unarmed, in their Sunday clothes and chanting church hymns, began to approach the Palace Square in detachments, the troops, on the instruction of the Grand Duke Vladimir[1] closed the access to the Square and shot the demonstrators down. The scene that followed was one of incredible butchery. The strikers were without any means of resistance, and the numbers massacred are entirely uncertain.

The effect upon the workers was electric. Gapon's message (No. 144) justly reflects their state of mind. All over Russia the loyal workers were driven into revolutionary paths, and accepted the instructions of the Socialists. On the other hand, the middle classes themselves were undoubtedly shocked beyond measure. The magnitude of the crime, its wanton and public character, made no palliation possible. The resolutions given in Nos. 146 and 147, are those of bodies which cannot be supposed to have any Socialist inclinations or proletarian connections. It is therefore most important to observe their unequivocal tone of protest and their perfectly sincere declaration of solidarity with the workers. With this enforced unity of classes the Revolution begins.

The news of the massacre produced strikes and riots all over Russia. Everywhere the machinery of officialdom was in visible danger and the objectionable officials were executed by thousands. In Poland the Russian administration practically ceased to exist in the country districts. To reply to this the Tsar took two steps. The first was to alter the personnel of his Government. Mirsky was replaced by another "liberal-minded personage," Buligin, and the brutal General Trepov made Chief of Police and Governor-General of St. Petersburg. In the second place, the waning authority of the Greek Church (No. 148) was brought into play, and a select deputation of workers was brought to the Tsar to hear his defence (No. 149), if it may be so called. In spite of this, the strike movement, while relaxing occasionally in vehemence, spread continually throughout January and February. Trepov attempted to meet this by fresh terrorism. Von Plehve was supposed to have said, "I will drown the Revolution in Jewish and Armenian blood." Trepov attempted to carry this out. Pogroms and massacres were revived on a terrible scale. One of these deserves particular attention—the Baku slaughter. From February 6th to the 10th the dregs of the Tartar population in Baku,

[1] The Tsar, who was personally a coward, had fled from St. Petersburg on the 19th, because of an accidental shot at a religious ceremony.

with the connivance and incitement of the authorities, massacred the helpless Armenian population continuously. The effect of this action was similar to the result of Trepov's policy all over Russia. The opposition was forced into unity. The Baku Stock Exchange—which, surely, could have been made a counter-revolutionary body—passed a resolution containing these words:

"It is the unanimous and deep conviction of the whole Baku Stock Exchange that the massacres were not caused by any race or religions or class animosity.[1] They would not have taken place had there been no exterior incitement from sources authoritative in the eyes of the ignorant populace. And at the commencement the massacres could easily have been stopped had the citizens in accordance with their desires been allowed to intervene."

The Caucasian revolutionaries were also forced to forget their differences. The manifesto which they issued after the massacres was signed in common by:—

The Federal Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Parties of the Caucasus.
The Tiflis Committee of the Social Democratic Henchak Sakartovelo Party.
The Federal Socialist Committee of Tiflis.
The Social Revolutionary Committee of Tiflis.
The Committee of the Revolutionary Armenian Federation of the Caucasus.

This document was symbolical of the unification which was happening all over Russia.

The Governmental Terror, however, was for once helpless in face of the resistance of the social revolutionaries. The climax of a series of punishments which few could be found to regret was the execution of the Grand Duke Sergius, on February 17, in the Kremlin at Moscow. The justification of this by the social revolutionaries (No. 151) is given as a typical document of its kind. Eventually, on March 3, the Tsar began to yield. In the morning he had issued a manifesto reaffirming his autocracy: in the afternoon he at last yielded and proclaimed his intention—not, of course, serious—of calling an advisory Duma (No. 152). At the same time Trepov's power was made superior in fact to Buligin's, and from April to June a continuous series of small administrative reforms[2] was promulgated and advertised carefully.

A temporary lull followed the March manifesto. During this period the Liberals once more became prominent. The bourgeoisie, headed by Miliukov, for the moment held political leadership. Particularly noteworthy is the immense growth of Trade Unions among the professional classes, who formed the Left wing of the Liberal movement. These Unions, with an increasing number of workers and, later, peasants, formed in May the "Union of Unions" in Moscow. For the moment Miliukov was able to control this, and used it as an instrument to spur on the Zemstvos, while

[1] This statement of the Baku Stock Exchange is true not only of this, but of nearly all pogroms and massacres. They were artificial movements inspired by the officials
[2] Detailed in the *Cambridge Modern History*, xii, p. 351.

checking it in its turn by the Zemstvos. He trusted that the Union of Unions would provide the numbers while the Liberals of the Zemstvos would provide the leaders. Eventually, when the Union began to acquire political experience, it rejected Miliukov and turned to really revolutionary action, but for the moment his device was brilliantly successful.

It was again the Tsar's Government and the Holy Orthodox Church which forced revolutionary action upon the Russian people. The various organisations for pogroms (See Nos. 153 and 160) increased their activities as the Russian situation in the East grew more desperate. Massacres of Jews and students were resumed on a large scale. In addition, the Cossacks joined in the massacres, particularly in Poland. At this moment, however, began the two movements which alone gave the Revolution a chance of permanent success—the revolt of the peasants and of the army and navy. The general opinion, up to this date, is truly reflected in the Lettish manifesto of June (No. 155). Except in those districts which suffered also from national oppression, an armed revolt was not possible owing to the backwardness of these two sections. This now began, very slowly, to change. Peasant "disorders" had begun as early as February 23 in Orel and Kursk and spread to Chernigov. The Peasants' Union, which was founded in June, 1905, and admitted to the Union of Unions, took upon itself to organise and express this discontent. It was a spontaneous growth and not at first Socialist; it is for that reason a more certain and important index. Its programmes and reports (Nos. 154, 157, 158), particularly the Delegates' reports (No. 158), are of the highest importance. Fortunately, their character is too clear to need comment.

Parallel to the slow-moving peasant battalions[1] began a small movement in the army and navy. Certain regiments were deeply infected with discontent and the revolutionaries allowed themselves to be misled by this. The navy was particularly revolutionary, and the confidence of the Government received its worst shock by the revolt of a portion of the Black Sea Fleet—the *Kniaz Potemkin*, which was joined by the *Gorgei Pobiedonosetz* and a torpedo boat. The revolt (No. 156) came to nothing, but was instrumental in shaking the Government still further and encouraging the revolutionaries. No doubt, also, the destruction of the Russian fleet by the Japanese on May 28 had a deep effect even in official circles. From the third Congress of the Union of Unions (June 14-16) may be dated also its emancipation from Miliukov. The *tempo* of the Revolution was quickening every day. The Liberal bourgeoisie was acquiescent, because the dislocation of industry had reached the proportions of a national crisis. Count Heyden, an Octobrist and a member of the Right in the first Duma, set the example of disregarding police regulations at a Zemstvo Congress in Moscow on July 19.

The Imperial Government made up its mind to yield concessions, which it hoped would be sufficient to restore its authority. It was already engaged in negotiating peace with Japan, and, apart from its inability to resist further, it knew well that unless order could be restored, no money could be raised in

[1] L. Trotsky, in his History of the Second Revolution, truly says that the first Revolution failed because the peasant battalions moved too slowly.

Europe to save it from financial ruin. Hence, on August 19 was issued an Act establishing a "Gosudarstvennaya Duma" (State Duma) with purely consultative powers. The town working men were excluded from the suffrage and the large landowners' vote was heavily weighted. The Land Captains were in charge of the peasant elections. The Peace of Portsmouth followed, on August 29. As though in order to show that the character of the Government was unchanged, the authorities excited a fresh and far more terrible massacre of Armenians in Baku during the first week of September. The massacre spread to Erivan, Tiflis, Shusha and the Jebail district, and did not cease till September 24.

The manœuvre of the Government had the desired result. It divided Miliukov's followers from the revolutionaries. The Zemstvos, which by now Miliukov more or less controlled, decided to accept the gift of the Duma and partake in the elections, after a formal protest. This was arranged at the last great Zemstvo Congress on September 25 (No. 159). On the other hand, the revolutionary forces decided to boycott the Duma, and a common manifesto to that effect was signed by the Social Revolutionaries, the Social Democratic Labour Party, the Lettish Social Democratic Labour Party, the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party, and the Polish Social Democratic Party. Pogroms and incitations to massacre, of course, continued. No. 160 is a specimen of the documents, which were, fortunately, ceasing to move the peasants to action. The disorders in Volhynia which followed this particular one were excited with the greatest difficulty, and consisted of little more than rioting by priests at the head of a few paid ruffians belonging to Black Hundred organisations.

Fortunately, the defection of the Liberals arrested the advance of the Revolution only for a moment. In the country the harvest was very bad (60 per cent. of the normal). Famine was terrible in the grain-producing provinces and the Government's soldiers were fully occupied. The peasants of 161 *uyezds* (counties)—37 per cent. of Russia—rose in revolt. The landlord's buildings were burnt down and his territories divided. The persons of the oppressors were sent away unharmed. Where the Peasants' Union was in control there was no violence, in other districts there was occasional but rare bloodshed. This movement continued with varying intensity right into 1906, when it was calculated that in Little Russia 57 per cent., in the Black Sea territories 63 per cent. of the country was in revolt. But the immediate cause of the Revolution was the action of the towns.

Towards the middle of October a general strike of printers broke out in St. Petersburg. On October 17, five great factories joined the printers. On October 20 the strike spread to Moscow, and the next day nearly all Russian railways ceased to run. The whole administration of the country was thereby held up. The Government remained obstinate, and for six days the strike continued, until, on the 27th, Trepov ordered his soldiers to shoot without stint. In reply, all the Unions came out, including the professional Unions; all banks, business offices, law courts and schools were closed; even doctors and

magistrates refused to work. On the same day (October 27) was founded the St. Petersburg Soviet.

This body was originally a purely *ad hoc* organisation created for running the strike. It instantly became the chief revolutionary body in Russia. It exercised authority far beyond St. Petersburg, and admitted members from distant regions. It consisted of delegates from all the bodies concerned in the strike. It included delegates from the Professional Unions, and secured their obedience. Its numbers rose to about 400, of whom 300 declared that they belonged to no party, 30 were Social Revolutionaries, 70 were Social Democrats. It may be described as a gigantic strike committee, and upon its shoulders henceforward lay the conduct of the Revolution. Its first President was Khrustalev (Nossar), its second and last Leon Trotsky (Bronstein), in 1918 People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs.[1]

On October 30 it had forced all employers to close their works, on the threat of wrecking, and stopped all payment for lodging and food. Had it had any armed force at its disposal, or if Trepov's men had been sufficiently educated by propaganda, the Tsarist despotism would have ceased then and there. Unfortunately, it had to be content with the yielding of the Tsar in his Manifesto of October 30. This contained three clauses: (1) Grant of personal liberty, and freedom of conscience, speech and association; (2) a promise to enfranchise the classes hitherto excluded, without delaying the elections to the Duma; (3) absolute power over legislation given to the Duma, together with "a share in surveillance" of the actions of the administration. Trepov, Pobiedonostsev, etc., were dismissed shortly after, and Count Witte, who was largely responsible for the rapid industrialisation of Russia and thus counted as a Liberal, took their place. The strike was called off on November 1.

Here began the short false dawn of Russian liberty. The Soviet was a power nearly equal to the Government, and the new-found liberties of discussion and union were exercised to the full. The Soviet was fully aware of the instability of these conditions and called off the strike, merely to resume it upon the first convenient opportunity. Generally, however, it was felt that at least the major portion of the people's demands were secured, and the newly formed Cadet Party[2] was active in opposing further action. With the blindness of all Liberal Parties, it conceived that the work of the masses was finished and all that was necessary was for themselves to take control. In some country districts the peasantry actually took over the government and the land, in others they arranged a temporary joint occupation with the landowner until the Duma should restore them the land altogether. In some districts there were only riots; in the Baltic Provinces, on the other hand, in virtue of the resolution here numbered 162, the peasantry expelled the landlords, destroyed the old *régime* and took over the government. Though the peasants were at last

[1] All Russian revolutionaries were forced by the oppression of the Government to take refuge under pseudonyms. Just as Trotsky's original name was Bronstein, so Lenin's was Ulianov.

[2] Constitutional Democrats, so called from its initials—Miliukov's party.

acting vigorously, the military forces were still practically untouched. Although the list of revolts in the army and navy is imposing—Kronstadt, Vladivostok, Ekaterinodar, Kiev, Voronezh, Bobruisk, Novorossiisk, Moscow and Sevastopol (where they held the town against the Government and were only driven out after a pitched battle)—they were inspired by casual grievances and had only occasionally a real revolutionary basis. In any case, the strength of the revolutionaries was wasted in isolated outbursts. Moreover, the success of the Revolution drove the Liberals into the arms of the Tsar: now that the privileges of the upper classes were attacked, they began to rally to the Throne. Moderatism increased: the same Zemstvo Congress (November 19) which refused to join Witte's Cabinet also refused to ask for a Constituent Assembly, for fear of the Revolution. The majority in this case was formed of Cadets. This party was more and more finding that it could not lead the Left, and certain members, notably Miliukov, led it into opposing the Soviet. Eventually, its influence, together with the Octobrists',[1] detached many of its supporters from the Soviet and hastened the collapse of the Revolution.

It was, however, the absence of any military force upon the side of the Revolution which led to its ultimate failure. Almost immediately after the proclamation of October 30 the whole machinery of bureaucracy was put in motion to assure the revolutionaries' defeat. The police, no doubt with the connivance of Durnovo, the Minister of the Interior, instigated attacks upon known Radicals and Jews all over Russia. The *Tribune Russe* gave accounts of massacres immediately following the Manifesto at Kiev, Orsha, Tomsk, Tver, Saratov and Odessa. In the last place the slaughter of the Jews was carried out on an unheard-of scale. The troops, particularly the Cossacks, fired upon crowds in Warsaw, Kishinev, Kazan, and Poltava and assisted in the massacres at Odessa. The revolutionaries had no military force to oppose to these outrages, and as the officials, fearing for their livelihood, extended their scope and violence every day, it began to be clear that without some drastic action the Revolution would be in fact "drowned in blood." The Soviet determined to try conclusions with Witte again, and took as the occasion the exclusion of Poland from the Duma, by the Ukase of November 13. It called a general strike on November 14. In No. 161 are reproduced the minutes of its session during the strike. Two points are noticeable—(1) The complete power of the Soviet over the St. Petersburg organised workers. The Union of Unions was now definitely adhering to it; (2) the beginning of a development into an All-Russian popular government, as is shown by the admission of the Kharkov delegates. Unfortunately, the Soviet had no influence whatever over the general body of the army, although it had friends in the St. Petersburg garrison. It also noticed with astonishment that its strike order, although punctually obeyed, had no effect upon the Government. As is inevitable, the effect of a political general strike depends upon its novelty: once the first terror of the authorities has worn off, they will realise

[1] A party yet further to the Right, not of importance for our purpose, led by Shipov.

that the continuance of the strike will hurt the workers more than them. Unless the workers can follow up the disorganisation of industry by a sharp military stroke, any revolutionary strike is foredoomed.[1] This particular strike laboured under the further disadvantage that large sections of Russian peasants and workers still believed that the October Manifesto was not a sham and had really granted their needs, while the bourgeoisie, alarmed by the growth of revolutionary sentiment and the continued interference with business, was passing over to the enemy in streams. The strike ended on November 19.

The failure of this blow was followed by an intensification of the White Terror. In those districts in which the peasants had already assumed the government they were punished, sometimes with appalling ferocity. One of these governors, the Governor of Saratov, gained a peculiar fame from his after career. His name was Peter Stolypin. The account of his restoration of order at Khvalinshin (No. 163) may be taken as typical of a large section of Russia. Over all the countryside the old forms of Government, partially destroyed by the Revolution, were being set up again by violence, and the actual tangible work of the Revolution was being destroyed. In the towns, where as yet the hand of repression was not so heavy, the bourgeoisie and sections of the workers still inclined to adopt the view that the Duma would grant all that was needed, and that the troubles in the country were merely "agrarian disorders" which should be repressed. This general apathy, together with a revival of trade, reduced the Soviet to comparative helplessness.

Early in December, therefore, Count Witte's government took open action against the Revolution. Freedom of the Press, the most important concession so far, was withdrawn on December 9. Khrustalev had already been arrested and his place taken by Trotsky. Martial law was proclaimed in St. Petersburg on December 12, and all meetings and strikes were forbidden, under heavy penalties. The revolutionaries replied by a Manifesto (No. 164), which was intended to provoke a financial crisis. It failed in its objective. We may also gain an idea of a further reason for the failure of the revolutionaries when we realise that this was the first common manifesto issued by the Socialist parties. More hopes were founded upon the general strike of Postal and Telegraph Workers upon December 14. But although it impeded and irritated the Government for nearly two months, its effect was not really serious.

In face of the weakness of the Soviet, the Government took action which finally defeated the Revolution. On December 16 it arrested nearly all the remaining members of the Soviet (225), the Executive Committee of the Peasants' Union, of the Postal and Telegraph Workers' Union, and some other prominent Labour bodies. Realising that unless this stroke was parried the Revolution was defeated, the Socialist Parties, after a momentary pause, called another general strike. 125,000 workers in St. Petersburg obeyed the

[1] Cf. G. D. H. Cole: *The World of Labour*, p. 193, *sqq.*

call, but the strike was not general. It was fitful, unequal, and hesitating. The revolutionary energy was exhausted, and the failure of the November strike had disheartened everybody. In Moscow, the second capital of Russia, the strike was far more successful and complete. On the 22nd, it turned into an armed revolt. The Revolution now became a last desperate armed struggle to overset the Government. The Moscow Socialists were supported by similar revolts in Kharkov, Ekaterinoslav, Saratov, Rostov, Novorossiisk, Pyatigorsk, Sochi and Sukhum, but the centre and heart of the revolt was in Moscow. The nature of the fighting was considerably affected by the change in military weapons. The barricades were no longer the towering barriers of Paris in '48, but small and higgledy-piggledy heaps merely sufficient to make a cavalry charge impossible. The revolutionaries abandoned them when in difficulties, and retired to another, carrying on a sort of guerilla warfare in the Moscow streets. This was necessitated by the small numbers of their forces, which were composed largely of students. The population of Moscow helped neither side, and the fight might have gone on indefinitely had not the Tsar's guard been brought down by one of the railway lines which was still working. On December 27 the revolutionaries began to be overwhelmed, and on December 31 the fight was over.[1]

With this defeat the Revolution really ended. But there was a long and terrible epilogue, which, though it has been over-estimated, was of real importance to the revolutionary movement—the calling of the first and second Dumas. For the moment the revolutionaries did not realise their complete defeat, nor the Government the certainty of its victory. While the backbone of the movement, so to speak, had been broken at Moscow, the limbs still moved convulsively and sporadic outbreaks kept occurring. The Government was continually afraid that some accident might bring back a crisis similar to last year's. On the other hand, it was still financially in difficulties, and had to consider the will of the only master that could really command it—international finance. If it could "restore order" and summon a Duma and present at least the *simulacrum* of a civilised State, it would be able to draw more liberally upon funds which at the moment it found rather difficult to get. The agrarian revolts, and the famine, made it clear that nothing more could be extracted from the peasants.

Under the influence of the Moscow rising, Count Witte had issued on December 24 a Manifesto which largely extended the franchise. Nearly all the classes previously excluded were granted votes, and also eligibility. On the other hand, the votes of the propertied classes were still given greater importance and the franchise weighted in their favour. The method of election remained indirect, and certain sections of the proletariat were still excluded. Nevertheless, the Duma was made more popular in its composition and was accepted by the Cadet Party. It was, in fact, elected on a basis admirably calculated to produce Liberals, especially as the Bolsheviks and the Social Revolutionaries had decided to boycott it. The Cadet Party, we must

[1] There is only one adequate account of the Moscow Revolution, which is in H. W. Nevinson's book, *The Dawn in Russia*, pp. 129–197.

observe, had begun to turn to a more revolutionary programme after the disappearance of the Soviet, and the bourgeoisie and their "Moderate" followers among the peasantry were given their chance to make their Revolution as it pleased them. The failure of the First Duma represents their failure following upon the defeat of the Socialists, and may be roughly compared to the defeat of Ledru-Rollin and the Mountain in France in 1849. In this case, too, the success of their tactics depended upon the proper routine of bourgeois parliamentarism being observed on both sides. If they gained a majority, it was calculated, the Government would be dependent upon them, since the international financiers would refuse to lend to it without the proper parliamentary security.

The Government, therefore, had two tasks to perform, if it was to survive. In the first place, it had to extirpate the revolutionary movement so that it should never revive. In the second, it had to get money from Europe and thus frustrate the perilous calculations of the Parliamentarians.

The method pursued in the first task was extermination. Durnovo, Minister of the Interior, and his agents deliberately attempted to kill, torture, or imprison any one in the lower ranks of society who had taken part in any Radical or Nationalist demonstration, or who had shown any independence of mind or manner, had resisted any injustice, or was personally disliked. The document here numbered 165 is typical. The Russian Revolution met a fate which is, perhaps, unique in history outside of Spain. It was defeated by a Government's attempt to extirpate it by murdering all who held a revolutionary faith, by terrorising with savage punishments all who were in any relation to the objectionable parties. The official figures, which are presumably an under-estimate, give in a single month (January 7 to February 7, 1906) 78 newspapers suppressed, 96 towns put under martial law, 1,400 persons shot—exclusive of Moscow, where, after the rising, there were undoubtedly very many massacred—10,000 arrests, and 17 new prisons opened. By such means the Government hoped, not merely to extirpate the Revolution, but to secure that the terrified peasants, in the "bad" districts, would elect reactionaries to the Duma. As regards the quieter portions of Russia, the reactionaries had so often repeated the legend of "the peasant's Little Father, the Tsar," that they had begun to believe that the electors would, from love of the Tsar, really select reactionaries. When the elections came due, however, these peasants elected almost entirely Cadets and members of the Labour Group, which adopted, practically, the Social Revolutionary programme Hence, Durnovo and his successor, Stolypin, extended the punitive expeditions all over Russia till not one refractory village, it was hoped, had not been beaten and massacred into dumb and tortured obedience.

As the strength of the Government increased, it began to provide for itself defences against the Duma. On March 5 the "fundamental laws" were declared outside the competence of the Duma. These "fundamental laws" were defined later. Among them were inserted the constitution of the

legislative bodies of the kingdom, all estimates founded on existing laws or ordinances, the Civil list and war credits, details of loans, etc. If the Duma did not pass the Budget, the Government could substitute that of the preceding year. Army, navy and foreign policy were declared the Tsar's prerogatives. Strikes, meetings and associations were practically forbidden. The Press law was tightened, etc., etc. The Duma, however, could have overturned all this had the Government still been in financial difficulties.

In spite of the appeals issued by the Cadets to foreign financiers, the Tsar's Government succeeded, on April 14, in floating a loan of £90,000,000, 32 millions of which were subscribed in London. It was commonly alleged the secret intervention of the French Government was responsible for this success. In any case, the Duma, when it met, found itself powerless. Every act, resolution or decree that it passed was instantly vetoed, the ministers ceased to attend its sessions. One decree alone (a vote of £1,500,000 to meet famine) was passed. The Duma found itself entirely neglected and powerless. The Government was occupied in repression and in watching for an occasion to dissolve it.

The Duma met on May 10, 1906. It contained over 200 Cadets, nearly 130 peasants, who formed themselves into an Independent Labour Group (the "Group of Toil") and ten of the Menshevik section of the Social Democrats, which had not boycotted the elections. The National Democrats held all the Polish seats, and there were about fifty Conservatives and Octobrists. Professor Miliukov was not a member, but "wirepulled" from the lobbies.

The Duma, though powerless, did not prove useless. It acted as a vast sounding board for revolutionary agitation. It was possible to expose each instance of cruelty and incompetence, and to be certain of reaching the ears of the public. The short period of this session had a most valuable educative effect upon the backward sections of the Russian people. With remarkable courage, an individual deputy—such as Tsereteli, to take a notable instance—would deliver an accusation of the Government, general or upon some particular point, knowing that his own imprisonment would be the result, but risking that for the sake of publicity. The Duma demanded a responsible Ministry, drafted a long programme of civilised legislation, including equality before the law and the abolition of race, class and religion privileges, showed up the police organisation of repression, and was preparing a plan for the resumption of the land. The Cadet majority insisted on compensation, to which the Labour Group—which, nevertheless, still believed in a peaceable evolution of the Russian land problem—objected, and left the House. However, the Cadets issued an appeal to the peasants to ignore the Ministry's project and carry out its decree. Then, while the question was still under discussion, the Duma was forcibly dissolved. It left as its last instruction to the peasants and warning to Europe, the Viborg Manifesto (No. 166).

The long and slow story of the Duma's failure to accomplish anything, merely owing to the Tsar's resistance, and the occasion chosen for its dissolution, had a deep effect upon the peasantry. All that the Socialist parties had

been saying was now, as it were, publicly written out slowly in a large hand for the dullest peasant to understand. The Duma of 1906 had carried the Revolution into the heart of the peasant.

The further story of growing reaction and terrorism does not interest us in detail, except for one point. Peter Stolypin, who now took the Premiership, carried out a plan, which he labelled "progressive," and which provoked a certain flutter among the entirely unintelligent reactionaries. The individual peasant was given the right to require his share of the land from the Commune, and facilities were provided, by means of the Peasants' Bank, for the richer peasants to increase their holdings. By this means Stolypin hoped to split the Russian peasant solidarity and create a village bourgeoisie which would wreck the chances of a Revolution. His plan recommended itself to the Liberals as being on the orthodox lines of capitalist competition; the dislike of the peasants was helpless and voiceless. The punitive expeditions were now a regular institution, secret courts-martial were massacring wholesale, death was the penalty for even ill-manners to an official.

Stolypin succeeded in creating this bourgeoisie, and, for a time, in destroying the Revolution. In this he found an ally in Miliukov[1]. When, in March, 1907, a Second Duma was called in the hope that it would support Stolypin, it was found that the Cadets were reduced to 94, while the Socialist parties had over 200 seats. The Cadets, whose Viborg Manifesto (p. 391) had been almost revolutionary, practically passed over to the reactionary side during the session. Obsessed with the idea that a firm protest would merely lead to another dissolution, they ignored the tyranny and lack of freedom, voted money for the punitive expeditions, omitted to demand the amnesty, accepted the Government's land programme, and confined themselves to criticism of details. They showed great anxiety to work with the Government, and thus, although they did not save the Duma from dissolution, they succeeded in cementing the alliance between the Tsar and the bourgeoisie.

In June, 1907, the Second Duma was dissolved and another called, which was elected purely by the upper classes. The last relic of the Revolution had disappeared. The 1907 harvest was good and the peasantry was tired. The bourgeoisie was now definitely *ralliée*, and the Cadet Party was able to pursue quietly its task of "mock opposition in a mock Parliament." From this time, as from 1848 in Western Europe, dates the definite separation of the industrial capitalists from the rising proletariat. It was now certain that when the Revolution came it would be a Socialist and not a Liberal Revolution.

[1] See W. E. Walling: *Russia's Message*, pp. 286–311.

Bibliographical Note

Russia has been the subject of an immense mass of generally second-rate journalist writing. Among these, however, may be found certain works of pre-eminent value:

(1) General histories of the previous revolutionary movement:—

STEPNIAK: *Underground Russia.* (An old book, but still valuable).

P. KROPOTKIN: *Memoirs of a Revolutionary.* (2nd edition.)

K. ZILLIACUS: *The Russian Revolutionary Movement.* (Probably the best for our purpose, being a connected and impersonal history).

(2) Histories of 1905:—

There is no history in English of the 1905 Revolution. It becomes necessary to rely on more or less "popularly written" books, such as:—

W. E. WALLING: *Russia's Message.*

G. H. PERRIS: *Russia in Revolution.*

H. W. NEVINSON: *The Dawn in Russia.*

The last is far and away the best. For the mere facts, chapters xii and xiii of volume XII of the *Cambridge Modern History* will be found valuable. They are written by a singularly ardent admirer of Miliukov (Sir Bernard Pares), whose predilections are reflected in the account. There is a large bibliography of Russian works.

(3) Miscellaneous. The massacres and pogroms which eventually destroyed the Revolution may be studied in:—

SEMENOV: *The Russian Government and the Massacres.*

P. KROPOTKIN: *The Terror in Russia.*

There is a book of contemporary essays which requires no comment:

LEON TROTSKY:—*Our Revolution.* (Henry Holt, U.S.A.)

A useful special study, though very short, is:

E. O. F. AMES (ed.):—*Revolution in the Baltic Provinces* (extra volume I in the Socialist Library).

Perhaps the most vivid picture is given by a novel:

"Ropshin" (B. SAVINKOV): *What Never Happened.*

Documents

1904 February 8: Russo-Japanese War.
1904 May 1: Japanese force the passage of the Yalu.
1904 May 3: Port Arthur invested.
1904 July 28: von Plehve killed.
1904 September 3: Russians forced to retreat at Liao-Yang.
1904 September 8: Prince Sviatopolk Mirsky appointed.
1904 October 15: Russians defeated at Sha Ho.
1904 December 27: Tsar's manifesto reaffirming autocracy.
1905 January 2: Fall of Port Arthur.
1905 January 18: Strike at the Putilov Works, St. Petersburg.
1905 January 18-22: Strike spreads to other works.
1905 January 22: "Red Sunday" Procession.

143 PETITION OF THE WORKERS TO THE TSAR ON JANUARY 22

Sire,

WE, the workers of the town of Saint Petersburg, with our wives, our children and our aged and feeble parents, have come to you, Sire, in search of justice and protection. We have fallen into poverty, we are oppressed, we are loaded with a crushing burden of toil, we are insulted, we are not recognised as men, we are treated as slaves who should bear their sad and bitter lot in patience and in silence.

We have borne it. But each day we are pressed deeper into the mire of poverty, of helplessness and of ignorance; despotism and arbitrary law crush us and strangle us. Sire, our strength is exhausted, the limits of patience have been overpassed. We have reached that terrible moment when death is preferable to the prolongation of insupportable suffering. Therefore, we have left our work and declared to our masters that we shall not resume it until our demands are granted.

What we ask is little. We only desire that without which life is not life, but prison and eternal torture.

Our first demand was that our employers should examine our needs in common with us; but even this has been refused us, we have been refused the right to speak of our needs on the ground that the law did not recognise it.

Illegal also was held our demand that our hours of labour should be reduced to eight a day; that our employers should establish the price of our labour in common with us and by our consent; that our differences with the subordinate management of the workshops should be examined; that the salary of labourers and women should be raised to a rouble a day; that overtime should be abolished; that we should receive careful medical attendance free of insult; that the workshops should be so conducted that we could work in them and not meet our deaths from terrible draughts, rain and snow. According to

our employers, all was illegal: our whole request was a crime and our desire to improve our lot—an outrageous insult to the employers.

Sire, there are more than 300,000 of us here, and all by aspect and appearance *men*. But in reality, we are not permitted any of a man's rights, not even the right of thinking, of meeting together, of examining our needs, of taking measures to better our lot. Whoever among us dares to raise his voice in defence of the rights of the working class is thrown in prison, is sent into exile. A good heart, a pitying spirit among us is punished as a crime. To pity an oppressed, tortured and defenceless man is a grave offence.

Sire, is this in harmony with the divine law in virtue of which you reign? Is life possible beneath such laws? Is it not better to die, better for all of us, the workers of all Russia? Then let the capitalists and officials alone remain alive and rejoice. This, Sire, is what faces us, it is this that has collected us beneath the walls of your palace. Here we seek our last refuge. Do not refuse to protect your people; raise it from the grave of arbitrary power, poverty and ignorance; permit it to dispose of its own fate; free it from the intolerable oppression of officials; destroy the wall between yourself and your people—and let it govern the country with you. For you reign for the happiness of the people and this happiness is being stolen from us by officials: it never reaches us; we only receive suffering and humiliation.

Consider our demands with attention and without wrath: they lead to good and not to evil, Sire. It is not arrogance that makes us speak, it is the knowledge of the necessity to escape from a situation intolerable to us. Russia is too great, her needs are too varied and important for officials to be able to govern her by themselves. The people themselves must rescue her, they alone know her real needs. Therefore, do not repulse their aid but accept it. Order at once the convocation of the representatives of Russia, of all classes and all orders. Let them all be present, capitalist, worker, priest, doctor and teacher; let all, whoever they be, elect their representatives, let every one be equal and free in his right of election. To achieve this, order that the elections to a Constituent Assembly be carried out on the basis of universal, secret and equal suffrage.

This is our most important demand; in and on it rests everything. It is the chief balm of our wounds: without it they will continue to bleed and bring us to an early death. But this measure alone cannot heal all our wounds. Others are necessary, Sire, and we will speak to you of them as to a father, frankly and openly.

Necessary are:

I. *Measures against ignorance and the arbitrary power which exists in Russia.*

(1) Individual liberty and inviolability, Liberty of speech, the press, meeting, and of conscience in religious matters.

(2) Universal compulsory education at the expense of the State.

(3) Responsibility of ministers to the people, and guarantees of legality in the administration.

(4) Equality of all before the law.

(5) Immediate release of all who have suffered for their convictions.

II. *Measures against the poverty of the people.*

(1) Abolition of indirect taxes and the institution of a direct and graduated income tax to replace them.

(2) Abolition of yearly payments of indemnity,[1] cheap credit, and *the gradual return of the land to the people.*

III. *Measures against the oppression of Labour by Capital.*

(1) Protection of labour by the law.

(2) Freedom for associations of consumption and production and personal associations.

(3) An 8-hour day and the regulation of overtime.

(4) Freedom for the struggle of Labour against Capital.

(5) Participation of working-class representatives in the drafting of a law on State Insurance of the workers.

(6) A minimum wage.

Here, Sire, are the most pressing needs which we have come to declare to you. *Order and swear* that they be executed, and you will make Russia glorious and happy and leave your name for ever engraved in the hearts of our grandchildren and great-grandchildren. But if you do not order them, if you give no answer to our prayer, we will die in this very place before your palace.

We have nowhere else to go; what could be our aim? Two roads alone are open to us. One leads to freedom and happiness, the other to the grave. Tell us upon which we are to travel, Sire: we will follow it without a murmur, even though it be the way of death. May our lives be a sacrifice for dying Russia. We will make the sacrifice freely and without regret.

1905 January 22: Massacre in front of the Winter Palace.

144 GAPON'S LETTER AFTER THE MASSACRE

22nd January. Evening.

Comrades, Russian Workingmen,

THERE is no Tsar. Between him and the Russian Nation torrents of blood have flowed to-day. It is high time for the Russian workman to begin without him to carry on the struggle for national freedom. You have my blessing for that fight. To-morrow I will be among you. To-day I am busy working for the cause.

(Signed) GEORGE GAPON, Priest.

[1] To the nobility who had owned them as serfs.

145 RESOLUTION OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY, JANUARY 23

St. Petersburg, Monday.

Proletarians of All Countries, Unite!

Citizens,

YESTERDAY you saw the savagery of the monarchy. You saw the blood running in the streets. You saw hundreds slain in defence of the workers. You saw death. You heard the groans of wounded women and defenceless children. The blood and brains of working men has stained the pavements that they laid. Who directed the soldiers' rifles and shot against the breasts of the workers? It was the Tsar! the Grand Dukes, the ministers, the generals, the scum of the Court! There are the murderers —may they meet death. To arms, comrades! Seize the arsenals, depots and magazines of arms; destroy the prisons, comrades, and free the defenders of freedom; destroy the police and gendarme stations and all the Governmental buildings. Down with monarchic government! We will establish our own government—the Revolution and the Constituent Assembly of the People's representatives!

146 RESOLUTION OF THE ADVOCATES OF ST. PETERSBURG, JANUARY 23

THE Order of the Advocates of St. Petersburg cannot remain indifferent to the horrible massacres perpetrated by the government upon those who shared the opinions of all Russian society, opinions expressed among others in the resolutions of the Advocates of St. Petersburg upon November 21st, and upon precisely those persons who had gone openly and pacifically to present these claims to the Government. The Order of Advocates is unable to express its indignation at the conduct of the officers by whose orders the soldiers were led to fire on peaceable citizens and attack as enemies persons who had come to express the desires of the people. In consequence of these events this extraordinary meeting of advocates and probationary advocates, to the number of 325, has passed the following resolution:—

The terrible experience of the last few days must persuade all society that the opinions which unite the workers to all the intellectual and suffering sections of our people are being broken by the pitiless hand of the Government, which will not even listen to the voice of the needs of the people, and thus brings about bloodshed. The duty of Russian society is to use all its vital forces to come to the rescue of the workers who are dying for their faith in the peaceful realisation of their opinions.

147 RESOLUTION OF THE NOVGOROD ZEMSTVO CONCERNING THE EVENTS OF JANUARY 22

(1) The present régime has inflicted upon Russia at once external and internal crises and the horrible events of the last few days which have resulted from the labour movement in St. Petersburg. The repressive measures used by the administration to defeat this movement, and their results—the enormous numbers of workers killed and wounded—cannot bring calm to Russian society, but on the other hand lead to the growth of a revolutionary movement which threatens the country with innumerable disasters;

(2) Desiring with all their hearts the peaceable economic and social evolution of Russia, the deputies of the Novgorod Zemstvo, obedient to the voice of their consciences and their duty to their country, declare it immediately necessary to convoke representatives freely elected by the people and by their aid to place our country on the road of peaceful development in accordance with the principles of right and the mutual dependence of the Government and the people;

(3) The deputies of the Zemstvo of Novgorod beg the President of the Assembly, Prince Galitsin, to carry the present declaration to the Minister of the Interior.

(*Signed by the President and thirty-eight members.*)

148 THE MESSAGE OF THE HOLY SYNOD (JANUARY 27) TO THE MEMBERS OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH.[1]

THE grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.[2]

The Lord hath stricken our beloved land with a heavy misfortune. For nearly a whole year Russia, in following out her historic task as the missionary of Christianity in the Far East, has carried on a bloody war in the name of her honour and dignity, insulted by the sudden and shameless attack of the enemy. Although our most pious monarch was full of the love of peace, and little inclined to this war, war was yet inevitable * * *

But, behold, a new trial from God, a punishment far more bitter than the first has descended upon our well-beloved country.

In the capital and other towns of Russia strikes of the labouring classes have begun and disorders have occurred in the streets. Russians for many years members of the Orthodox Church and always accustomed to declare for the faith, the Tsar and the country, have been excited by evil-intentioned persons, by external and internal enemies of the country, have abandoned by tens of thousands their peaceable occupations and resolved to obtain

[1] This and Nos. 153 and 160 are counter-revolutionary documents inserted because religious persecution of Labour is a phenomenon hardly known to us in England.

[2] II. Cor. xiii. 14.

together and by force their so-called violated rights. To the peaceful inhabitants they have caused much alarm and disquiet. They have left many without bread and have taken others in their midst to a useless death, impenitent and with bitterness in their hearts, and on their lips insults and abuse * * *

Workers of Russia, children of toil! Work, according to God's word, with the sweat of your brow, and remember that he who will not work, neither shall he eat. Beware of false counsellers who, pretending anxiety over your needs and well-being, foment disorders which lose you your homes and your food. They are the lesser agents and paid tools of the evil enemy who desires the destruction of Russia.

Children, well-beloved in Our Lord of the Holy Orthodox Church of All the Russias, the Holy Synod hopes that you will imprint in your heart the true doctrine which is here presented to you, and it calls down upon you its apostolic blessing.

"Mercy unto you, and peace, and love, be multiplied."—(Jude i. 2.)
In humility, ANTONIUS, Metropolitan of Saint Petersburg and Ladoga.
In humility, VLADIMIR, Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna.
In humility, FLAVIAN, Metropolitan of Kiev and Galich.
In humility, NICHOLAS, Archbishop of Finland and Viborg.
In humility, CLEMENT, Bishop of Vinnitsa.

1905 January 28: February: Strikes and riots spread to Moscow, Riga, Reval, Odessa, Warsaw, Lodz, Radom, Kovno, Saratov, Vilna and Mohilev.

149 THE TSAR'S MESSAGE TO THIRTY-FOUR WORKERS' DELEGATES ON FEBRUARY 1 (RUSSIAN, JANUARY 19)

I HAVE summoned you to hear in person My will and communicate it directly to your comrades. The unfortunate events which have occurred recently and produced their sad but inevitable results, have been caused by the fact that you have been led into error by traitors and the enemies of our Country and because these people have deceived you.

In inviting you to present to Me a petition concerning your needs, they were inciting you to take part in sedition directed against Me and My government: they made you quit your honest toil at a moment when all true Russians should work ceaselessly together to conquer our stubborn external enemy.

Strikes and seditious meetings only drive the idle crowd into disorders which have always forced and will always force the authorities to resort to armed force, which necessarily causes the death of innocent victims.

I know that the worker's life is far from easy. There are many things to improve and organise; but be patient. You yourselves know well that it is

necessary to be just also to your employers and take the interest of Our industry into consideration.

But it is a crime to summon a seditious assembly to declare to Me your needs.

In My solicitude for the workers, I will take care that everything possible is done to ameliorate their condition, and to give them the means and power to express their new needs, as these shew themselves.

I believe in the honour of the workers and their unchangeable devotion to Me. And I pardon them their fault.

Now return to your peaceful labours: do you and your comrades resume work, having made the sign of the Cross.

God be with you.

150 LEON TROTSKY: "THE EVENTS IN ST. PETERSBURG," FEBRUARY 2

THE Revolution has come. One move of hers has lifted the people over a whole flight of steps up which in times of peace we should have had to drag a painful and tired journey. The Revolution has come. It has destroyed the plans of many politicians who had dared to make their little political calculations with no regard for their master, the revolutionary people. The Revolution has come. It has destroyed scores of superstitions, and has manifested the power of the programme which is founded on the revolutionary logic of the development of the masses.

The Revolution has come, and the period of our political childhood has passed. Into the archives has gone our traditional liberalism, whose only resource was the belief in a fortunate change of administrative figureheads. Its period of bloom was the meaningless reign of Sviatopolk Mirsky and its ripest fruit was the Ukase of December 27th. But now, January 22nd has come and effaced the Spring.[1] It has put military dictatorship in its place and has promoted to the rank of Governor-General of St. Petersburg that same Trepov who just before had been ejected from the post of Moscow Chief of Police by the same liberal opposition.

Liberalism which was not interested in the revolution, which hatched plots behind the scenes, which ignored the masses, which counted only on its own diplomatic genius, has been swept away. We have finished with it for the entire period of the revolution.

Now Liberals of the left wing will follow the people. They will before long attempt to take the people into their own hands. For the people are a power. We must lead them. But they are also a revolutionary power. Therefore, we must master them. Clearly this will be the future tactics of the Osvoboshdenye[2] group. Our fight for a revolution, our preparatory work for a revolution, must therefore also be a merciless fight against liberalism for influence over the masses, for a leading rôle in the revolution. In this fight

[1] See note on p. 350.

[2] "Liberators." The Left wing of this Party—Constitutional Monarchist, non-revolutionary—became the Cadet Party, whose tactics were exactly these.

we shall have the support of a great power, the simple logic of the Revolution.

The Revolution has come.

The form taken by the uprising of January 22nd could not have been foreseen. A revolutionary priest, placed in a perplexing manner at the head of the working masses for several days, lent to the events the stamp of his personality, his conceptions, and his rank. This form may mislead many an observer as to the real substance of the events. The actual meaning of the events, however, is just that which Social Democracy foresaw. The central figure is the Proletariat. The workers start a strike—they unite—they formulate political demands—they turn out on the streets—they gain the enthusiastic sympathy of the entire population—they engage in battles with the army[1] * * *

The proletariat has arisen. It has chosen an incidental pretext and a casual leader—a self-sacrificing priest. That seemed enough to start with. It was not enough to bring victory.

Victory demands not a romantic method due to a plan based on an illusion,[2] but revolutionary tactics. A simultaneous action of the proletariat of all Russia must be prepared. This is the first condition. No local demonstration has any serious political significance now. After the St. Petersburg uprising, only an all-Russian uprising should take place. Scattered outbursts would only consume the precious revolutionary energy with no results. Wherever spontaneous outbursts occur, as a late echo of the St. Petersburg uprising, they must be made use of to revolutionize and to unite the masses, to popularize among them the idea of an all-Russian uprising as a task of the approaching months, perhaps only weeks.

1905 February-March: Spread of strike movements over Poland, Courland, Livonia, Esthonia, and large parts of Russia proper as far as Ekaterinoslav and Irkutsk.

1905 February 6-10: Baku massacres.

1905 February 17: Execution of the Grand Duke Sergius by the Social Revolutionaries.

151 ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE EXECUTION

A.

By combat your rights can be conquered.

On Friday, 17th February, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon in Moscow, the Grand Duke Sergius Alexandrovitch Romanov was executed for a crime against the people, by a member of the Organisation of Combat.

Signed:

The Organisation of Combat of the Social Revolutionary Party.

B.

A bomb has just punished with death the chief author of the Moscow

[1] This is inaccurate. The workers were unarmed and the resistance was of the slightest. A few barricades were thrown up on Basil Island, but the affray was generally a mere massacre.

[2] Gapon's faith in the Tsar.

massacre, the murderer of thousands of St. Petersburg workers, the hero of Khodynka, the oppressor of Russia, the bitter enemy of liberty and light.

This vile debauchee, the unclean hangman who thought he could insult a great people with eternal impunity, is dead. The voice of the people has spoken with a terrible unanimity. Peasants, workers, members of Zemstvos and councils and even of the assemblies of nobles, declare aloud: "Enough, we are not children and will no longer be the wretched slaves of the Romanovs. Down with autocracy! We demand our rights and our liberty." Rights and liberty! For the gang of Grand Dukes, ministers and officials, this means the renunciation of arbitrary power and peculation of the people's money. Rights and liberty. Such is the demand of the people whom these malefactors despise and rob. Shot and prison. That is their reply. An incredible crime has just been perpetrated. Thousands of workers who went unarmed, suppliant and hopeful with their wives and children to interview the Tsar have been pitilessly massacred.

The strikers of Warsaw, Riga and Lodz are being shot down: the sharp rattle of a volley is heard and thousands of workers fall never to rise again. Russia is governed by the creatures of Sergius, Trepov and Buligin. Trepov has unlimited powers. These men are without faith, law, honour or conscience: what will they do to our country, where are they dragging her, into what abyss of shame and sorrow will they throw her? Gorky and tens of other men of letters are thrown in prison. And this is but the beginning. A deep cloud covers the land. Can anyone watch these events coldly? We call to the struggle all—yes, all who have not strangled the feeling of honour within them.

Let us prove we are not slaves and cannot be intimidated or insulted with impunity. To violence oppose violence, arms to arms. Let the terrorist blow which struck down Sergius be the first rumble of the people's wrath, the storm of the reviving spring. Let the armed people by a general attack destroy outright the lair of these savage Romanov beasts and build on its ruins the city of light and liberty.

Death to the people's enemies! Honour to the heroes!

Signed:

The Moscow Committee of the Social Revolutionary Party.

Feb. 18th.

152 EXTRACTS FROM THE TSAR'S TWO MANIFESTOES OF MARCH 3

(*a*) Disturbances have broken out in our country itself, to the joy of our enemies and our own deep sorrow. Blinded by pride, the evil-minded leaders of the revolutionary movement make insolent attacks on the Holy Orthodox Church and the lawfully established pillars of the Russian state, thinking that by severing the natural connection with the past they will destroy the existing order of the state and set up in its place a new administration on a foundation unsuitable to our Fatherland.

(*b*) I am resolved henceforth, with the help of God, to convene the worthiest men possessing the confidence of the people, and elected by them to participate in the elaboration and consideration of legislative measures.

1905 March 10: Complete defeat of the Russians at Mukden.
1905 April 29: Decree giving liberty of worship to the Old Believers.

153 "BLACK HUNDRED" PROCLAMATIONS OF APRIL AND MAY, 1905

I.

ON the 17th of February of this year the Grand Duke Sergius Alexandrovitch perished at the hand of a cowardly assassin. Another noble soul has departed for a better world. Russians, reflect where we are going! Into what an abyss! Whom did Sergius' death benefit?

His entire life was devoted to defending the Russian people against the insolent Jews. He worked with all his strength to prevent the Jews from exploiting the Russians; he would not permit Holy Moscow to be made into a Jewish city. That was why the Jews decided the fate of the Grand Duke. They bought a cowardly Socialist to kill him, for all the Socialists are bought by the Jews and the Japanese.

This cowardly Socialist killed the Grand Duke. True Russians, do not believe the lies of the Socialists! They are all bought by the Jews.

Put an end to them in the real Russian way!

THE UNION OF THE RUSSIAN LAND.

II.

Roman Catholic Priests, Poles and Jews are now trying to re-introduce serfdom into Russia. They assist the Japanese in the war and send large sums to help them, but have not given a farthing to the Russian Red Cross. The Tsar has said privately that if he could only get rid of the Jews and the Poles he would divide large tracts of the Crown lands among the peasants.

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX COMMITTEE.

1905 May, first week: Massacres by the Cossacks in Poland at Lodz, Warsaw and Kalish.
1905 May 21: First meeting of the Union of Unions.
1905 May 28: Destruction of the Russian Baltic Fleet by the Japanese.

154 FIRST PROGRAMME OF THE PEASANTS' UNION, MAY, 1905[1]

1. Affairs of State shall be carried on by the people. Its representatives shall be named not merely by the nobles, but also by the peasants, having the

[1] The Peasants' Union was admitted on June 7 to the Union of Unions at the Moscow Congress. At that time it had only organised 40 *volosts* in 7 governments. Compare with this the list on p. 376.

same rights and without any interference in the elections by the Governors, the Zemski Nachalniks or other officials.

2. The popular representatives shall make the laws, vote the budget, making sure that the rich shall pay more than the poor and subjecting the authorities to a strict and vigorous control.

3. No Russian may be deprived of liberty by the order of a village policeman, a Governor or a minister; only by the order of a jury may a Russian be imprisoned after clear proof of a crime.

4. Any Russian may summon a meeting to discuss the people's needs and no minister, Governor, Zemski Nachalnik, or policeman may forbid it.

5. To defend their common interests Russians may organise societies, Associations and Trade Unions without authorisation and only the magistrates, after a verdict by a jury, may dissolve them.

6. Any Russian may publish journals and books and discuss in them the actions of officials and the needs of the State, without any authorisation. Only a legal verdict by a jury can suppress such journals or books.

7. The causes of the present distress of the peasants are: Lack of land, excessive taxation and the ignorance fostered by the authorities. To remove these sources of misery the peasants organise their Union. They declare that the peasants (such as the Starchina of the volosts and the Starosta of the villages) who appear to be elected cannot be their representatives since they are, in fact, subject to the arbitrary will of the Governors and Zemski Nachalniks whose orders they carry out faithfully.

1905 June 23: Battle in Lodz between the workers and the police and soldiers.

155 RESOLUTION OF THE LETTISH SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY AT THE JUNE CONGRESS, 1905

Considering,

THAT the only genuine democratic element in Russia which could seize power and establish a democratic administration of affairs is the proletariat,

That the Russian proletariat, especially in Central Russia, is not sufficiently class conscious and well-organised to start an open rebellion,

And that an armed uprising in isolated parts of the empire, without the participation of the rest of the proletariat, could be suppressed by the autocracy in the most violent manner,

This Congress of the Lettish Social Democratic Labour Party does not think it advisable to invite the proletariat to such hasty action. It considers that its chief aim is to stir up the workers' class consciousness, to organise and to direct the proletariat in its struggles; but while the repressive measures of the government do not permit the adoption of such a course, the Congress advises the workers always to be prepared for an armed uprising, parrying

each violent act of the government with an armed fist, and turning skirmishes with the Tsar's henchmen into never ceasing guerilla warfare.

1905 June 27: Revolt of the *Kniaz Potemkin*.

156 MANIFESTO OF THE CREW OF THE "KNIAZ POTEMKIN"

Citizens of all Countries and all Peoples!

BEFORE your eyes is unfolded the great epic of the struggle for freedom. The subject and enslaved people of Russia can no longer support the agelong abuses and tyranny of the despotic autocracy.

The deprivation of all rights, the ruin and poverty to which the Russian Government has reduced our country has exhausted the patience of the masses of the workers. The fire of indignation and revolt has blazed up in all towns and villages. The terrible cry "Down with the chains of slavery and despotism and up with liberty!" has risen from the throats of millions of Russians and echoes like thunder across the vast extent of Russia.

The Tsarist Government would rather drown the country in the people's blood than allow it freedom and happiness. The guiltless blood of heroes runs in streams in our country. Yet the infatuated autocracy has forgotten that the army, though up till now the obscure, forgotten, and blind instrument of its bloody plans, is yet part of the people and composed of the children of these same labourers who fight for liberty. Sooner or later the army will realise this and cleanse itself of the evil stain of the blood of its brothers and fathers.

That is why we, sailors of the armoured cruiser Kniaz Potemkin have unanimously and firmly resolved to take the first great step. Let all the victims, all the workers and peasants who have fallen beneath the bayonets and shot of the soldiers in the towns and countryside, spare us the curse which falls on murderers. We are not the murderers and hangmen of our people, but its defenders. Our device is: "Death or freedom for all the Russian people." We wish happiness and peace for our unhappy country. We demand the immediate cessation of the bloody and stupid war which reddens the plains of distant Manchuria. We insist upon the immediate convocation of a Constituent Assembly based upon universal, direct, secret and equal suffrage. To secure these demands we are unanimously decided to win or die with our cruiser.

We are deeply convinced that all free citizens and the workers of all countries and nations will answer our struggle for liberty with warm sympathy.

Down with autocracy! Long live the Constituent Assembly!

The crews of the armoured cruiser Kniaz-Potemkin and of the torpedo-boat 267.

1905 July 9: The *Kniaz Potemkin* surrenders to the Rumanian authorities.

157 RESOLUTION PASSED AT THE FOUNDATION OF THE PETROVSK (SARATOV) BRANCH OF THE PEASANTS' UNION IN JULY, 1905

WE are born and bred in the villages: we know no other life than agricultural labour. We are unable to occupy ourselves with anything else because we lack the means. Agriculture must feed us, must give us the possibility of saving a few pennies for the dark days, the years of famine, to provide a dowry for our daughters and support us while our sons are in the army. It has to enable us to pay taxes, to pay for our elected officials, our clergy, our schools, our hospitals, to construct roads and pay the indirect taxes, which are the most important and fall entirely upon us. From us, in the main, are exacted the taxes on alcohol, petroleum, tea, sugar, and matches. Hundreds of millions of roubles have to be extracted from our land to pay for the needs of the state, and yet on the land that we own we can only live in semi-starvation.

The lack of land is our chief suffering, but the lack of freedom increases our suffering still more. So many officials are over us that at times we do not know which to fear most. We do not know why there are so many, or who has appointed them, we only know that the majority here are like prison warders. One would think that peasants were the vilest criminals. The officials all shout and swear at us, and threaten us with imprisonment, flogging, the *nagaika*, and forced military service. They have only one law, it is the club. They have only one gentle word, it is "Give."

The Land Captains, the police captains, the police Colonels, and the Governor, even the elected officials and the priests who should be our fathers in Christ, do nothing but mock at us. Our assembly has no power over them. All the power is in the hands of officials and the upper classes. We build schools to have our children taught. We want our children to learn the truth in these schools, but undesirable teachers are sent us by the authorities. They teach our children all kinds of stupidities instead of true knowledge, they forbid them to read good books, and hide the truth from them.

We do not know what is done with the taxes extorted from us, but we know that if they are not paid promptly we are violently treated. We have no real justice, nor any defence against injustice. If we attempt to defend ourselves soldiers are sent to beat us. It is our brothers and sons who do the beating, our brothers and sons whom we tear from our families to defend the Fatherland. But they are taught only how to kill their own brothers and never learn how to defend the Fatherland.

This cannot last. We declare that we find it necessary to have this changed.

Persons elected by everybody should govern the country and not the officials alone. All voters should be equal, rich and poor, educated and uneducated. The people's representatives must give equal laws to all and investigate the way in which the people's money is spent.

The army must be replaced by a popular militia, so that every man should learn military science at home and during his free time. We are sure that such a militia in time of war will be able to defend our frontier as well as the present army.

The people must have freedom of meeting and of speaking freely on all subjects, on affairs of state and social questions. The censorship must be abolished. All crimes must be tried by a jury and no one must be kept under arrest for more than two days without trial.

Taxes should not be levied, as now, on the poor alone. A certain percentage of one's income should be taken, and this percentage should be increased with the size of the property; a large part of an inheritance received by will should be taken also, since it is not earned money.

Full freedom of conscience should exist. The clergy should be elected by the people. Education should be free and equal for all and the Government should pay for it.

Finally—and this point is the most important and will end our misery and slavery, which still exists while alongside the labouring peasant live landlords who enrich themselves by the peasants' labour, because they have appropriated to themselves the property of God—finally, it is essential to confiscate all private estates and to return them to the village communities who will give only to those who will cultivate it in person. Only when this is done will the people begin to live and have a settled livelihood; unless it is done a great misfortune awaits our country.

For the realisation of these demands we find necessary the immediate convocation of a Constituent Assembly on the principles of universal, equal, and secret suffrage.

For the struggle to obtain these reforms we are founding the Peasants' Union of the district of Petrovsk. The founders are all the members present at this meeting.

1905 July 31-August 1: First Congress of the Peasants of all Russia.

158 REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

[*This congress first definitely organised the Peasants' Union as an all-Russian body. Delegates attended from the Governments of*

Vladimir	*Vologda*	*Voronezh*	*Viatka*
Kaluga	*Kazan*	*Kostroma*	*Kursk*
Kharkov	*Kherson*	*Tula*	*Chernigov*
Moscow	*Nizhni Novgorod*	*Orel*	*Poltava*
Riazan	*Saratov*	*Smolensk*	*Yaroslav*

The Black Sea Region The Region of the Don]

From the delegates' reports concerning the growth of the movement in their districts.

Delegate of the DON: This region is vast, but there is no order in it. This is because the majority of the population is enslaved and will remain so as long

as the peasants do not realise their strength and rights. Even as things are, in spite of the complete absence of rights it is quite possible to find legal means to awaken and direct the people. By legal means I mean the right, given by the manifesto of the 3rd March, 1904, of meeting to discuss questions of State organisation * * *

The authorities intervened [*to prevent this, but as we had invited the local priests and landowners also*] they eventually gave way Other obstacles were raised by the priests. One of them, for example, instructed his congregation from the pulpit not to listen to the chiefs of the movement, the two intellectual brothers. In the space of a month we thus organised 8 volosts with 25 villages covering about 60 square kilometres.

This shows that it is not impossible to imbue the peasants with the idea of passing resolutions concerning their needs. Now the importance of such resolutions is very great. Soon the law concerning popular representation will be published. If it is so drawn up that the lords again have alone all the advantages we shall again have to show solidarity and unanimously demand rights for the peasant population oppressed by the present despotism.

Delegate of KHARKOV: It would be just that one who works should reap the fruit of his toil and the idler should have nothing to eat. In fact it is the reverse with us: the man who works starves and the man who does nothing has an easy life. This is because the land, which is God's property, had been seized by the lords who exploit our labour.

To begin with, we must draw up resolutions like those in the Don: it is the more necessary because in my own district, Sumy, there are hardly 3 dessiatins of land per head, and in some districts less than half this.

Our life is so hard that we cannot be silent any more. The mother only gives her child the breast when he cries. We have cried already, but nobody has given us anything. We must turn to other measures to get the land. Our peasants have taken part in the meetings of the agricultural Society of Sumy, they discussed their needs and decided that the land should belong to the cultivator. The Society was closed. [5,000 *persons collected in Sumy and signed a petition, but the delegate carrying it was arrested. Other meetings were held.*]

1*st Delegate of CHERNIGOV:* * * * The mirs have been in communication with each other and demand liberty and land. Everywhere the peasants think that private property should be confiscated with recompense, and the property of the Crown, convents, etc., without recompense. The land should be the resource of those who cultivate it themselves, not excepting Jews, merchants and nobles. The recompense should be calculated upon the product of the land * * * Private property should be abolished. God created the earth and man took it, but has no rights over it. Bureaucracy makes us wretched, but the official does not use so much force to keep his place as a proprietor. If the lords take the power of the officials we shall be even worse off. If the rich come to govern us we shall be robbed even more. Take for example that unhappy country England: for 600 years it has had political

liberty and the people still suffers. If we let this year pass we shall not recover in 200 years what we have lost. We must unite for defence. We are at the end of our strength, we cannot live like this. At present, projects of emigration are put forward to deceive the peasants, but this is only deception * * * I know half of the Chernigov province as well as other regions and I can say that the idea of political and economic equality has reached our peasants. They also want compulsory universal education by the State.

1st Delegate of TULA: With us unfortunately the movement is not so big as elsewhere, still, it exists. [*Three years ago circles were founded which led to a Congress of all the peasants in June of this year, to found a section of the Peasants' Union. In Epiphan the peasants elected 25 delegates and at a meeting of these*] the peasants at first decided that they only wanted the land. "If we have the land," they said, "then we are our own masters." But it was explained to them that this was insufficient, that good laws were also necessary. [*To obtain these, the Epiphan peasants all joined the Union, but the Vice-Governor suppressed all further meetings.*] For the minute we are working in local groups to consolidate the Union we have organised.

The Delegate of KOSTROMA: With us, each peasant has $1\frac{3}{4}$ dessiatins of land or even less. The wages in the workshops are low. Everywhere the situation is bad, we have not even enough to feed our cows. Round us are Crown lands, which is very unfortunate for the peasant, since he is always being fined. The administration does not use them and we lack open land, but although it makes no use of them it will not give us them. The peasants want these lands for themselves. It is true we have a peasants' Bank, but only the rich peasants and village authorities use it. There are too many authorities * * *

The 3rd Delegate of VLADIMIR: We have not yet a very powerful movement: but we have often heard people speak of the activities of the Peasant Union and are very interested. We agree with the desires expressed. Our movement is spontaneous, there has been no propaganda among us: we have raised our voices only because our patience is exhausted. We are 100 millions while our oppressors are only a handful, and if we are tired of suffering we can easily be rid of them. Good journals now are playing an important part, particularly the *Syn Otechestva*.[1] We peasants, we spit on the *Moscow Gazette*.[2] Our peasants, too, have asked me to express here, in the Congress, their contempt for the Black gangs. They send their thanks to the intellectuals. The union of the people and the intellectual is a power that will break any obstacle.

1st Delegate of KURSK: [*Our Union was founded as a result of the Moscow Congress* (see p. 372) *by a congress of 47 delegates on June 16th. We have now a large organisation by sections covering eleven districts. But a central authority is lacking.*] The Kursk movement aims at political emancipation by

[1] Social Revolutionary.
[2] Reactionary.

means of a Constituent Assembly elected by universal, direct, equal and secret suffrage.[1]

The Delegate of VOLOGDA: In our region there is as yet no organisation [*the lack of land not being very severe. But the oppression by the officials is very great.*]

The intellectuals are working, and I think that our province too will be organised. People have spoken here of the unfavourable light in which the revolutionary proclamations appear to the people because they attack the Tsar. In the interest of truth, although my ideas about the Tsar's power are different, I must confirm this.

2nd Delegate of OREL: I know the conditions in the districts of Orel, Maloarkhangelsk and Livny. The peasants are too oppressed to come to this congress. The village bureaucracy has immense power[2] * * *

The Delegate of KAZAN: The Union is only in embryo in our province.

The Delegate of KHARKOV: We have no good schools. We have nothing good, we have only authorities. We must have election of deputies by the people. Our people are still not very advanced. They do not understand what is meant by a Republic and wish to keep the Tsar.[3]

The President put these propositions to the vote:

(1) Private property in land shall be abolished.

Carried unanimously.

(2) The land of convents, churches, appanages, the Crown and the Tsar shall be resumed without indemnity.

Carried unanimously.

(3) The land of private proprietors shall be resumed partly without and partly with indemnity.

Carried (6 votes against).

(4) The conditions of this shall be settled by the Constituent Assembly * * *

Carried unanimously.

Finally, the Congress unanimously passed a declaratory motion "That the land shall be the collective property of the people."

1905 August 19: Tsar's Manifesto establishing an Assembly with consultative powers.
1905 August 29: Peace arranged with Japan.
1905 September 7: Second Baku massacres.
1905 September 25: All-Russia Zemstvo Congress.

[1] The 3rd delegate of Kursk said that the Union was founded in July, by a meeting of eighty persons and had not yet any settled programme. The 2nd delegate (speaking later) said that their Union contained only twenty-two persons and had organised three villages. They must not attack the Tsar. Presumably, these last two were speaking for isolated districts only, which would explain the discrepancies.
[2] The first delegate of Orel complained chiefly of priestly exactions and cupidity.
[3] No further reports given.

159 RESOLUTION OF THE CONGRESS[1]

THE Zemstvo and Municipal Congress considers that the national Duma which is to be convoked according to the law of August 19th is not national representation in the true sense of the words; but, having in view the fact that electoral assemblies uniting a great part of the social forces of the whole Empire may serve as a rallying point and support for the general movement for the attainment of political freedom, the Congress recognises it as necessary that Russian citizens who are united on the political programme formulated by the Zemstvo Congresses of the preceding and present years should seek to enter the Duma in as large numbers as possible for the purpose of forming there a united group with the object of obtaining the guarantees for personal liberty and equality outlined in the resolutions of preceding Congresses, and with a view to organising the representation of the people on the basis formulated by the same Congress.

160 POGROM CIRCULAR SPREAD IN KIEV AND VOLHYNIA DURING OCTOBER, 1905

IN the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.

The great Anchorite of the Lavra in Kiev has ordered the people to be informed that St. Vladimir, who first christened the people of Russia, has risen out of the bowels of the earth, has awoken the Anchorite and wept with him concerning the Fatherland, brought to shame by Poles and Jews.

O God, where is the courage of that Russia who once drove back the foreign hordes? Shame and dishonour to the descendants of the holy Vladimir who tremble before a handful of cowardly Jews and the hooligans that they employ. All of us who still hold dear the name of Russia should know that the Jews and Poles are thirsting for our blood, that they are trying to set us by the ears so as to reach the throne over our dead bodies and thus overthrow the Tsar.

Let all gather in the Churches and take counsel there about the defence of the Fatherland against the Poles and the Jews.

Do not kill the Poles and the Jews[2] but give the students who are sent by them the sound thrashing they deserve.

Each person who receives this letter must make at least three copies and send them to other villages and towns.

He who has not fulfilled this order within six days will be stricken by grave sickness and affliction, but whoever spreads more than three copies of this letter, will be granted recovery from incurable diseases and prosperity in all things.

In the Cathedral of St. Sophia and the Cloister of St. Michael many will assemble, and when they go out they will cry to the people that it gather together against the Jews and the Poles.

[1] The first Congress which included Poles.
[2] Of course, this circular nevertheless led, as was hoped, to pogroms, and not student-beating.

1905 October 17: General Strike in St. Petersburg. Semianikosky, Alexandrovsky, Maxwell, Kotlass and Pall factories join the strikers (the Printers).

1905 October 20: Strike spreads to Moscow. General strike of railwaymen begins.

1905 October 21: Railway strike spreads to St. Petersburg and then to Kiev, Kharkov, Saratov, Vilna, etc. General collapse of the administration.

1905 October 27: St. Petersburg Soviet formed.

1905 October 30: "October manifesto" extending the suffrage and giving the Duma sole power to legislate, with right of joint control over administration.

1905 November 1: Strike stopped.

1905 November: Beginning of the Government's Reign of Terror. Troops attack crowds in Warsaw, Kazan, Kishinev, Poltava and Odessa. Government agents arrange massacres of Jews in Odessa, Kiev, Kishinev, Nikolaiev, etc., etc.

1905 November 13: Witte excludes Poland from the August and October manifestoes.

1905 November 14: St. Petersburg Council (Soviet) calls a second general strike.

1905 November 14-19: General strike.

161 FROM THE MINUTES OF THE ST. PETERSBURG WORKERS' COUNCIL (SOVIET)

14th November.

THE session is given to the discussion of the following governmental measures, (1) the transference of the Kronstadt mutineers to a Court Martial. (2) The proclamation of martial law in Poland.

The Polish delegates, who had arrived for this purpose in Poland, describe the exact character of the proletarian struggle in Poland, and show up the lies of the Tsarist government which gives as the pretext for its bloody actions territorial separatist tendencies which only exist in its own policemen's minds.

After an exchange of views and the hearing of the delegates of the Social Revolutionary Party and the two fractions of the Social Democratic Party, the resolution concerning the general political strike is voted unanimously.

15th November.

The first part of the session is occupied by the reading of reports on the state of the strike in the different workshops and factories. The strike is in full swing, not merely in all the shops which took part in the first general railway strike, but in many shops and factories which took no part in it. The resolution of the Council has been acclaimed in all the meetings held in the morning in the actual workshops.

A delegation of the *Novaya Zhisn* is heard, the St. Petersburg organ of the Social Democratic Party, edited by Maxim Gorky. The editorial staff ask for permission for it to appear * * * "There are no parties at the minute," it is said, and the journal's demand is rejected by a crushing majority.

Next are voted a series of measures to make the strike general:

(1) To make an appeal by placards to isolated workers.

(2) To delegate comrades to inform shops which are working that if they continue to do so, the Council will not answer for the safety of the machines.

(3) To go in groups through the workshops and stop work everywhere.

The Executive Committee is instructed to approach immediately the Union of Telegraph and Postal Workers to induce it to join in the general strike.

An appeal to cabdrivers is considered desirable, but a motion is adopted to the effect that caution must be observed in dealing with these workers so as not to play the game of the Black gangs which carry on extensive propaganda among these workers.

An appeal to soldiers and sailors is drawn up. The strike funds amount to £1,000. Immediate relief to the poorest strikers is voted.

16*th November.*

[*Appeal of Count Witte to his "brother workers" to return to work, read. Witte rebuked for his impertinent familiarity in addressing the workers as his brothers. Counter appeal adopted.*]

The Council delegates a group of comrades to interrupt the plays at the theatres Suvorin and Zhavorsky. The theatres are shut next day. The report on the continuance of the general strike and the arrests of comrades is heard.

A lively debate is aroused on the question of the continuance of the general strike. Thirty-two speakers address the Council. Opinion is almost equally divided and it is decided to refer the question to the sectional meetings of the delegates of the different quarters.

The continuance of the strike is voted. [*A counter appeal is adopted to a placard by the Prefect of Police.*]

The Printers announce that the Imperial Press has received the text of three proposed new laws on (1) Religious toleration, (2) Poland and the Jewish situation, (3) the Constitution.

18*th November.*

[*Comrade Makar, released with others from prison on the demand of the Council, is received with cheers. The President reads a letter from the Ministry of Marine which has urgent matter to print and wishes to know if the strike extends to it.*] The Council forbids any work at the Press of the Ministry of Marine * * * The report of the delegate of the Peasants' Union of the Sumsk (Govt. Kharkov) is heard. The following example shows the discipline among the hundreds of thousands of peasants in that Union. The Strike Committee called them out and at its appeal the wage-earners of the farms

and of all the estates in the North of the district struck on the same day and at the same hour. Even the cooks left work. The cattle were left without care or fodder. The lords ran to the nearest towns. The authorities entirely lost their heads. They sent delegates to the Strike Committee and at the same time sent for some *sotnias* of Cossacks. The Strike Committee refused to negotiate until the Cossacks were withdrawn. The Committee's demand was acceded to. The peasant strikers demand: an eight-hour day, the augmenting of their wages, convocation of a Constituent Assembly on the basis of equal, direct and secret suffrage. The strikers expect from the Constituent Assembly the *liberation of the land* and its transference to the workers. The peasant delegates of Sumsk demand to be admitted to the Council of Workers' Delegates. They explain their plan of campaign: (1) The peasants refuse to work for any landed proprietor, (2) They refuse to pay taxes, (3) They abstain from alcoholic drinks and buying vodka at the Tsar's public-houses, (4) They will not buy or sell with town or country proprietors.

The Assembly salutes the peasant delegates with thunderous applause.

[*The President welcomes them and invites peasant help in feeding the towns.*]

The question of stopping the strike is again discussed. A communication is read from the soldiers of the garrison of St. Petersburg announcing the mobilisation of six *sotnias* of Kuban Cossacks who have been called to St. Petersburg. The soldiers propose to resist their entry. They demand a fresh railway strike. [*Discussion interrupted while spies are ejected. Eventually a proclamation is adopted calling off the strike because the workers' strength must be kept for the final struggle, which demands further organisation.*]

19th November.

An account is received of the terrible massacre of peaceful workers by the Cossacks.

1905 November 19: Zemstvo Congress endorses the refusal of its members to join Witte's Ministry.

1905 November 19-20: Second Congress of the Peasants' Union in Moscow.

162 RESOLUTION PASSED SIMULTANEOUSLY ALL OVER LETTONIA AFTER THE GENERAL STRIKE

CONSIDERING that the autocratic government has always been the most cruel oppressor of the people, that this continues to be so even after the manifesto of October the 30th, and that peaceful inhabitants who try to realise the promise in the manifesto are arrested, imprisoned, shot and hanged, the Lettish people concludes that real freedom can never come from the existing government, and therefore the workers and peasants decide to establish for themselves local administrative councils, and to defend them if necessary by force, and together with the Russian people to work for the convocation of a Constituent Assembly.

163 KHVALINSHIN PEASANTS' DECLARATION CONCERNING THE GOVERNMENT TERROR[1]

THE 18th of November[2], 1905, we, the undersigned peasants of the village of Khvalinshin of the district of Sordobsk in the province of Saratov, being present at a meeting of the village assembly to the number of 215 persons, have discussed the arrests made by the order of General Sakharov.

On the 8th of November M. Sakharov arrived at our village accompanied by Governor Stolypin, by the chief officer of the district, the head of the district Police, other officials and a guard of Cossacks.

A village meeting was called together to which M. Sakharov explained the purpose of his visit and the powers with which he was invested. The Starosta (head of the Mir) and the village council desired to speak on behalf of the peasants in favour of sending a delegation to St. Petersburg to explain the misery of the peasants, but they were immediately arrested and beaten until they lost consciousness.

After a brief conversation M. Sakharov retired into the office of the village Court, after which Governor Stolypin called out one after the other the members of our commune and asked them the following questions:

"Have you pillaged the property of the landlord Beklenichev?"

"Have you burnt his house?"

"No," was the answer.

Then the Cossacks began to beat us with their *nagaikas*, to strike with their fists, their bayonets and the flat of their swords, to tear out the hair and beards of the miserable peasants. Several were beaten two or three times to force confessions from them. Some, covered with blood, finally confessed. All this took place under the eyes of the officials, who gave orders to increase the rigour of the punishment. This was the method of questioning the thirty-two men who have been arrested.

After these savage punishments Governor Stolypin proposed to the other peasants that they should sign a decree, by which the commune declared that it rejected these thirty-two men from its midst as dangerous persons. We did in fact sign this decree, for after the terror through which we had passed we did not have the strength to refuse. All the arrested men are now in prison.

As soon as we became conscious of the illegality of the acts of the authorities, we discovered that the officials who had come to us had done so upon the evidence of the local police, of spies and of other cowardly persons. Although the property of Beklenichev had been pillaged, the guilt of the thirty-two peasants of our commune was not proved. All the men arrested are good people and have never been known to have caused any damage in the village.

[1] This document is quoted by W. E. Walling (*op. cit.*, p. 241), who states that the original is in his possession. It is quoted here not merely because it is typical, but because the Governor of Saratov, under whose authority these events took place, was Stolypin, later Prime Minister of Russia.

[2] Presumably Russian style, 13 days behind ours.

They suffered their punishment owing to police spies and officials. The document that we signed on the 8th of November desiring these thirty-two men to be exiled to Siberia we consider to be illegal, because it was extorted from us by violence and torture. Therefore we have decided to address ourselves to the Council of Advocates, praying it to present our declaration to the central authority that it may be annulled, that a new inquiry may be ordered concerning the thirty-two peasants falsely convicted and that the officials who tolerated the savage punishments inflicted by the Cossacks may be cited before the Courts. We hope that our request will be heard.[1]

1905 November 24-28: Revolt of Sevastopol.
1905 December 6: Sakharov executed by the revolutionaries.
1905 December 9: Decree reviving the repression of the Press.
1905 December 12: Martial Law in St. Petersburg.

164 PROGRAMME FROM THE FIRST COMMON MANIFESTO OF ALL THE SOCIALIST PARTIES, DECEMBER 13, 1905

* * * We therefore require everyone,

(1) To refuse to pay the government any taxes or debts.

(2) To insist on gold in all transactions and payments of accounts: for sums less than 5 roubles, to demand silver or other metal.

(3) To insist on the repayment entirely and exclusively in gold of all deposits in savings banks and State Banks.

Russian citizens!

Autocratic Tsarism has never had either the confidence or the full powers of the Russian people. At the present time it is acting in the interior of Russia as in a conquered country. This is why we have resolved.

The Russian nation will refuse all payment for the loans contracted by the Tsarist Government since it is in open war against the whole nation.

Signed:

THE COUNCIL OF WORKERS' DELEGATES.
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PEASANTS' UNION OF ALL RUSSIA.
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE AND ORGANISING COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY OF RUSSIA.
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTIONARY PARTY OF RUSSIA
THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE POLISH SOCIALIST PARTY.[2]

[1] In some districts Sakharov used machine-guns to " punish " the peasants. (Report of the Saratov delegate to the Second Congress of the Peasants' Union, November 19).

[2] The Council of Workers' Delegates is, of course, the St. Petersburg Soviet. The journals which printed this Manifesto were suppressed, viz., *Syn Otechestva* (Social Revolutionary), *Novaya Zhisn* (Social Democrat), *Nachalo* (Social Democrat), *Nasha Zhisn*, *Svobodny Narod*, *Russkaya Gazeta*, *Russ*. Forty printing presses were seized in St. Petersburg alone. Only the servile *Novoe Vremya* and *Messager Officiel* continued to print.

1905 December 16: St. Petersburg Soviet arrested.
1905 December 20: Third General Strike called.
1905 December 21: Moscow Strike.
1905 December 24: Moscow Revolt.
1905 December 31: Revolutionary movement collapses.
1906 January-May: White Terror.
1906 March 5: Manifesto excluding the "fundamental laws" from the competence of the Duma.
1906 April 14: Successful floating of a loan of £90,000,000.

165 APPEAL TO THE CIVILISED WORLD AGAINST THE BESTIALITIES IN LETTONIA AND ESTHONIA[1]

EXACT statistics are not even yet to be had of all the brutalities perpetrated by the Russian Autocracy and the German Junkers in the Baltic provinces (Lettonia and Esthonia). Here we only give to the public a small part of the barbarities committed by them, to characterise the various categories and the approximate extent of the same.

More than 3,000 Letts and Esthonians were, without any trial or any court, simply on the strength of the order of so-called Field-Courts, composed of brutalised Cossack officers, German Baltic Junkers, Law Police[2] and police spies, shot, bayoneted or hung. Thousands of men have been flogged with rods and crippled with Cossack and dragoon weapons. As exemplary punishments, severe floggings were inflicted on entire communes, as, for instance, Oberpahlin, when neither children nor aged men over 70 were spared. In consequence of these tortures many died or went mad, or have been made cripples for life. *Even women have been stripped naked and flogged*, e.g., in Kongot and Randen, where Captain Von Siemens gave one woman 50, four women 100 strokes each, and two even 150 each.[3] In January, during the severest cold, a troop of Cossacks brought several women who only had underclothes on from the Carlsruhe estate to the town of Wenden, twelve miles distant; frozen quite stiff and unconscious, they were brought into the hospital, where one of them died the next day. Many women were outraged by the leaders of punitive expeditions and the German Baltic Barons, and infected with venereal diseases, as for example by Count Keyserling and Prince Lieven, and afterwards handed on to the Cossacks for further outrages. Peasants and revolutionaries condemned to death were martyred; the limbs were broken in two and the hands and legs tied so fast together that the strings cut through the flesh to the bones, e.g., this happened on the Estate Drobusch. Frightfully tortured, previous to their execution, were members of the

[1] I have carefully refrained from correcting the occasionally halting English of this Manifesto.
[2] Landjägern—*i.e.*, Land Captains. (See p. 344.)
[3] " I need not say that two hundred strokes . . . on the naked body of a woman or man would mean almost certain death in its most terrible form." Nevinson (*op. cit.*, p. 263.) The French, Italian and German versions of this document say " Colonel von Sievers."

Society of Lettan Social-Democrats,[1] W. Kahrlin[2] on the Estate Wainoden, and O. Augustsprogis on the Estate Preckuln. The bodies of the hanged were not allowed to be removed for several days; e.g., that of a member of our party, W. Strauss, on the Preckuln Estate, and the school teacher Sahlit, in Flechen Kreuzburg, who was hung on the station platform, the teacher Singberg, in Hasenpotshen Krein. The Riga police dislocated the limbs of the revolutionaries, tore out the tendons and flayed them in a most cruel manner to force them into giving evidence against themselves and their comrades.

The first destined to destruction were the institutions dedicated to popular education and culture, which had been set up by the Letts and Esthonians without any help from the German feudal lords or the Russian Government and despite all their reactionary intrigues. The theatre of the Riga Lettic Social Union has been transformed into a barrack, also many schools, houses and buildings of various Lettic Societies have been used as barracks.

Many societies' and people's libraries have been plundered and burnt down. Many writers and publishers, who could not escape in time, were arrested. For example, the writers Akuraur3 and Austrin and many of the same profession shot themselves, as also the teacher and writer Decrhozin and the publisher Bols; many bookshops were burnt with all the books. Great is the number of the school teachers who were shot, hung and flogged.[4] *In Ungerburg two teachers were even flogged before their pupils. All idea of morality and honour is trodden underfoot by the Russian Government and the German Baltic Junkers.* The punitive expeditions have plundered hundreds of peasants' farms and burnt them to the ground. These people, thus robbed of shelter and means of subsistence, are obliged to roam in the woods, or to live hidden in caves, potato trenches and haybarns. The neighbours are forbidden under penalty of death to give the people shelter. The mental state of the terrified peasants and the brutality of the punitive expeditions is best described by the following incident: In Dinsdurben, Government Courland, a number of dragoons surrounded a peasant's house on a frosty night, when one of the peasants whom they were after, jumped barefoot from a window, in only his underclothes, and bolted. After more than twelve hours wandering about in the woods and fields the wretched man returned, with torn, bleeding feet and half-starved with cold, to a neighbour. The latter, terrified of the death penalty, handed him over to the next punitive expedition who shot the half frozen man without any further ado. The burnt-down peasant homes

[1] " Latweeschu Sozialdemokratu Saweenibas "—the body issuing this Manifesto.
[2] " Karklin," other versions.
[3] " Akuraters," other versions.
[4] Flogging, the favourite punishment of the Tsar's government, was frequently so arranged as to give his agents sensual pleasure as an incitement to further brutality. The victim was tied down and her or his buttocks uncovered and beaten with either a wooden rod, the *plet* or the *nagaika*. Both of these last—the *nagaika* is a heavy Cossack whip, for the *plet* see Perris (*op. cit.*, p. 126)—were extremely brutal. Mr. Nevinson (*op. cit.*, p. 194) cites an instance in Moscow where the Governor, Dubasov, ordered all girls and boys at school, up to 18 years of age, who were suspected of undesirable opinions to be handed over to the soldiers, who were to strip them naked and beat them with the hand or rod. This the local upper classes considered an excellent joke; as also the case of a Lettish schoolmistress, who, not understanding the movements of the soldiers, who were uncovering her to flog her, thought she was going to be violated. This story was translated into four languages in Mr. Nevinson's presence, in case anyone should miss its exquisite humour.

were not allowed to be rebuilt. All the money which had been with the greatest difficulty scraped together was taken forcibly to the last penny from the peasants; for example, from the peasant Jakob Sprechdi in Nodagegen (Courland). Provender for the stock, agricultural instruments and machines, living and dead stock, corn and animals, all were destroyed by the expeditions, or stolen. The Cossacks alone have, according to the report of the Central Port Administration, sent away home from the Baltic Provinces three million roubles in valuables. In one word, in Livonia and Esthonia the Russian Government and the Baltic Junkers are at work to produce famine and epidemic disease.

The bestialities of these reactionary Junkers, which exceeded the cruelties of John [*Ivan*] the Terrible during the Livonian War in the 16th century, will be shown up by the impartial historian of Livonia and Esthonia. We call the attention of the civilised world to the fact that the executionary expedition corps, had they not been led on to them by the Baltic Junkers, i.e., by officers related to them, would never have allowed themselves to commit such bestialities. Clothed as officers, these morally and physically degenerate feudal lords went through the Baltic Provinces, accompanied by mad drunken Cossacks and dragoons, *made up lists of the guilty, set fire with their own hands to the peasants' farmyards, and shot and strangled the peasants, in cases where the very Cossacks sometimes refused to do such deeds.* On the "*lists of the guilty*" were to be found often names of quite harmless people, because they formerly in more peaceful times had not kissed the Junker's hand, or had even gone so far as to take legal action against them. Of the Baltic noblemen who specially distinguished themselves for bestiality, we will only mention the following: Prince Lieven (Fockenhof), Count Keyserling, Baron Manteuffel, Schröder, Brödrich, von der Reche, Voigt, Bar, Baer, Raden and Bar, Count Medem (Courland); Baron Schych, Brüner,[1] Baron Maydell and Wolff (Lithuania). Baron Maydell (Fere-Esthonia)[2] gave orders to fire on a peaceful peasant's farm buildings, and as the panic-stricken and innocent peasants ran away, he fired on the flying children, women and men. *In Sesswegen, von Rüngaston commanded that the coachman Narlow*[3] *who had called out as he was led to the place of execution, "Down with the rule of Force! Long live the Revolution!" should have his tongue pulled out then be strangled.* The punitive expeditions enforced the payment of rents in the most brutal fashion, and fined the peasants for any revolutionary act such as the destruction of spirit shops, or for the destruction of lists of taxpayers or recruits, etc., to unheard-of sums of money. Anybody who cannot pay the sum demanded within the appointed time, and it is very short, is mercilessly driven from his holding. For example, in the commune of Jewe, where the peasants were visited with a fine of 3,000 roubles, all were driven forth destitute at night and in bitter cold into the world and their houses officially sealed. Now, to characterize what role the Junkers have played in the outrages that were

[1] Read "Strick, Brummer."
[2] Read "Jewe, Esthonia."
[3] Read "Renngarten . . . Karlow."

committed, and are still continuing, on the Letts and Esthonians, as well as to illustrate the complete anarchy which prevails in the ruling circles, the following may serve as an example. Towards the end of December of last year the Governor-General of Courland, Von Belkmann, issued a circular where he ordered the members of the new revolutionary institutions which had appropriated the reins of government to appear before January 15[1] before the legal authorities to beg for grace. The ruling lords of Ar and Halm considered this measure too sentimental and not sharp enough. In their slavish organs (e.g., in the "Duma [*Düna*] Zeitung," etc.) they picked to pieces this ordinance of Von Belkmann, and with the permission of the provincial chief they started a general massacre throughout Courland.[2] This well-known fact gives the lie to the statement of the "Frankfürter Zeitung" and other bourgeois papers, that the poor Junkers were obliged to accompany the execution expedition by command of the Governor-General. Terror and horror had seized the Letts and Esthonians. It would almost seem as though the Russian Cossacks and Baltic Barons wanted to exterminate them, as even in fact many Junkers in conversation with foreign newspaper correspondents had expressed themselves. Only thus can we explain what is now happening in our country and to our unfortunate fellow countrymen.

Although in no fashion all the bestialities which were perpetrated in Livonia and Esthonia are to be excused, nevertheless we will try to make clear what called forth their brutality. The following is the answer to that: The Letts and Esthonians, who for 700 years have borne the burden of Junker rule, and are looked on and despised by the latter, even in their own country, as beings of a lower order, demanded equal treatment with the feudal lords in their church and school affairs as well as in the institutions of local government; they demanded also the equal division of the communal lands among all the landowners, the abolition of all feudal privileges, e.g., the exclusive right of the Junkers to set up breweries, spirit distilleries, mills and other industrial and commercial establishments; to open all houses, to fish or hunt, and they demanded the equality of all citizens before the law. As to the proclamation of an independent republic, there is not the slightest hint to be found in any Lettan or Esthonian publication, and this shameless lie was spread abroad by the Junkers to terrify still more the badly informed Russian Government and to make it a blind instrument in their hands. The Letts and Esthonians only demanded a widely extended territorial autonomy with their own Landtag in Riga. The much oppressed and shamelessly exploited agricultural labourers demanded besides a rise of pay and improved dwellings and conditions of labour. That is, in short, all the "impertinent" demands of the rebel Letts and Esthonians, over which the "gentlemanlike and law-loving" ruling lords pour out a veritable cry of wrath.

A sharp character was first taken by the movement in February, 1905, when the agricultural labourers struck work and arranged peaceful demonstrations in front of and inside the churches in order to bring to an end the

[1] Russian style, 13 days behind ours.
[2] The Italian version adds: "From the 2nd of January onwards (Russian style)."

reactionary agitation on the part of the pastors, who were wholly dependent on the Junkers, and thus to make a public protest against the Church being degraded to a political instrument in the hands of the German Junker and the Russian Autocracy.

* * * * * * * * *

How humane the revolutionaries and the people in general behaved to the Barons can best be seen from the following episodes: Baron Wolff von Schwanenburg (Government Livonia) shot two peasants with his own hand for refusing to agree to his unacceptable contract. This noble knight was afterwards captured by the people, but after a short time let go free again. In the neighbourhood of Kohenhusen, a couple of dozen Junkers were taken prisoners, along with the Cossacks accompanying them; nevertheless, after a couple of days, they were again released. To maintain order, the revolutionaries forbade the preparation and sale of spirituous liquors, and the people condemned most sharply all thieves and robbers. *Never have there been in the Baltic provinces so few thefts and murderous attacks to show as in the days at the height of the revolutionary movement.* This fact was known to the noble lords, as is to be seen from their own papers of November and December of last year.

There is hardly a single Lett or Livonian[1] to be found who has not, in one way or other, suffered from the bloodstained executionary expeditions. Officially, the latter are now abolished, *but in fact they carry on their torture and murder work secretly just as merrily as ever*, as appears from the Petersburg correspondent of a Livonian paper "Petersburg Atcals," April 28, 1906: "On the 13th April (the time is always according to the Russian calendar) five men were shot in Marienburg (Government Livonia) and two hung. *Among those shot was Fräulein Balod, a girl of* 16. Her brother was already shot in December. She herself was arrested a month ago. *After she had been flogged with* 100 *blows from the rod she was released. On the way home she sang revolutionary songs, for which she was at once again arrested and then forthwith shot. At the same time an old woman of* 61 *years accused of keeping weapons, was promptly shot.*

* * * * * * * * *

As champions of a true democracy of real justice, legality, and freedom, we will now take up the fight against the Russian reign of terror, and the brutalised German Baltic Junker. Shrinking from no sacrifice, no torture, we will do everything which the interests, the honour and the life of our much abused and badly treated working class demand of us.

THE UNION LETTISH SOCIAL DEMOCRATS.[2]

May, 1906.

[1] Read "Esthonian."

[2] A much smaller, though older, body than the Lettish Social Democratic Labour Party, which demanded its exclusion from the attempts at unification after January 22, 1905, on the ground of its insignificance. It was Social Revolutionary.

1906 May 8: "Fundamental laws" promulgated.
1906 May 10: Duma meets. Cadet majority.
1906 June 14: Police arrange massacre at Bielostok.
1906 White Terror continues.
1906 July 21: Duma dissolved. Stolypin appointed Premier.

166 THE VIBORG MANIFESTO. SIGNED BY ABOUT TWO-THIRDS (219) OF THE MEMBERS OF THE DUMA, ON JULY 23

To the people, from the popular representatives of all Russia.

THE Duma has been dissolved by a ukase of July 21st. You elected us as your representatives, you gave us instructions to fight for the country and for liberty. In accordance with your instructions, and with our duty, we drew up laws to ensure freedom to the people. We demanded the removal of irresponsible ministers who transgressed the laws with impunity and suppressed freedom. But first of all we wished to formulate a law for the distribution of land to the working peasantry, involving the Crown lands, the monastic and church possessions and the compulsory sale of private estates. The Government held this law inadmissible, and when the Duma once more urgently presented its resolution concerning a forced sale it was dissolved.

The Government promises to summon a new Duma in seven months. Russia will have to remain without popular representation for seven long months, at a time when the people are but a few steps from ruin, when industry and commerce are undermined, when the whole country is seething with unrest and the ministry is clearly incapable of doing justice to the popular needs. For seven months the Government will act arbitrarily, and will fight against the popular movement in order to obtain a pliant and subservient Duma. If it succeeds, however, in completely suppressing the popular movement, the Government will not convoke a Duma at all.

Citizens, stand up for the trampled rights of popular representation and for the Imperial Duma. Russia should not remain a single day without popular representation. You possess the means of acquiring it. The Government has, without the consent of the people's representatives, no right to collect taxes or to enforce military service. Therefore, now that the Government has dissolved the Duma, you are justified in giving neither money[1] nor soldiers. If the Government contracts loans to procure funds, these loans are invalid without the consent of the people's representatives. The Russian people will never recognise them and will not feel itself called upon to repay them. Until the people's representatives are summoned again do not give a farthing to the Crown nor a soldier to the Army. Be firm in your refusal: no power can resist the united and inflexible will of a nation. Citizens, in this enforced and inevitable struggle your representatives will be with you.[2]

[1] The peasant, however, could only refuse the direct tax, a tiny section of the budget already deeply in arrears, and that would have brought immediate punishment.

[2] 219 signatures follow, including the mass of the Cadet Party. The Left issued a yet more revolutionary, but rather incoherent, protest.

Appendix

167 DEBATES AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL ON THE CONTROL OF INDUSTRY, 1867, 1868, 1869

This should properly have come before the documents concerning the Paris Commune, but unfortunately I did not make a detailed study of the Congresses until after most of this book was in type.

In the First International are to be observed two main currents of opinion —Marxism, which was called Collectivism or Communism, and Proudhonism, which was called Mutualism. The latter was based on small proprietorship in the land and in industry. In the process of the victory of the Marxists a theory of workers' control was elaborated which owes much to the Mutualists. As will be seen, it was advocated that in those industries which were State-owned (only gradually did this come to mean practically all industries) the entire management should be leased out to compagnies *or guilds which would arise from the existing Unions. Frankel's decree during the Commune is an attempt to achieve this: that it went no further was due partly to the weakness of French Unionism. See my forthcoming book on* The Workers' International *for a fuller description of the circumstances of these debates.*

LAUSANNE, 1867.

[*Saturday, September 8th.*] The following are the conclusions of the Report [*of the Commission to study the State*]:—

(1) The State is not or should not be anything but the mere executor of laws voted and recognised by the citizens.

(2) The efforts of the nations should aim at making the State the proprietor of the means of transport and circulation, in order to break the powerful monopoly of the great companies, which by forcing the working class to obey their arbitrary laws attack at once human dignity and individual liberty. By this means both the collective and individual interests will be satisfied.

[(3) *It is necessary to democratise the penal system.*]

Longuet, of Caen, agrees with these conclusions, provided that it is quite understood that we define the State as "the collective body of citizens." Concerning the organisation by the State of railways, canals, mines, and public services, it is understood also that these services will not be run by State officials, and Longuet insists the more on this point because this observation applies equally to the National Bank on which he has spoken in his report on the credit question. He understands that railways, canals, mines, etc., shall be constructed, exploited or administered by working class Companies, who will be bound to give their services at cost price, without the possibility of making profits, that is to say, in submission to the general principles of mutualism.[1]

De Paepe, of Brussels, takes the opportunity afforded by Longuet's remarks to present again his thesis on the entry of the land into collective pro-

[1] Proudhonism.

perty. He says that the only difference between Longuet's theory and his is that Longuet accepts collectivism [*collectivité*] for all under the ground, for railways and canals, while he (de Paepe) wishes to extend it to the land as a whole.

[*The debate then turned on land nationalisation.*]

Brussels, 1868

Resolutions carried on September 13th.

(1) Concerning mines, oilwells and railways * * *

The Congress holds:

(*a*) That quarries, oilwells and other mines, as well as railways, in a normal society would belong to the social body as a whole, represented by the State, but by the State regenerated and subjected itself to the law of justice;

(*b*) That quarries, oilwells [*mines and*] railways will be conceded by society not to capitalists as to-day, but to workers' Companies, in virtue of a double contract; giving on the one hand the charter to the Company and guaranteeing to society the scientific and rational exploitation of the concession, the services of the Company at a price as near as possible to cost price, the right to inspect the Company's books and thus the impossibility of a reconstitution of the monopoly; on the other hand guaranteeing the mutual rights of each member of the workers' Association in face of his colleagues.

(2) Concerning Agricultural property * *

The Congress holds that economic evolution will make the entry of arable land into collective property socially necessary, and that the land will be conceded to agricultural companies as the mines to mining companies, and the railways to workers' companies and with conditions and guarantees for society and the cultivators similar to those necessary for the mines and railways.

[*Voting:* 30 *for.* 4 *against.* 15 *abstain.*]

Report of the Brussels section on strikes [*closing words*] * * Finally, to end this subject, we will say that if we are such great partisans of *sociétés de maintien de prix*, as they are called in Belgium, of *sociétés de résistance*, as they are called in France, of *trade's unions*[1] as they are called in England, it is not only from regard to the necessities of the present, but also the future social order. To explain, we do not simply consider these as necessary palliatives (note that we do not say remedies), no, our views are much higher. From the bottom of the chaos of conflict and misery in which we struggle we lift our eyes to a more harmonious and happy society. Then we see in these trade unions the embryos of the great workers' companies which will one day replace the capitalist companies with their thousands of wage-earners, at least in all industries in which collective force is used and there is no middle way between wage slavery and association. [*As has been shown by recent strikes, Union funds may be used for setting up co-operative productive societies.*]

Yet it must be noted (and this is an important point) that the productive associations to arise from the trade unions will not be the trifling societies that the present day associations are. These latter, excellent we admit, as example

[1] In English in the original.

and precept do not seem to us in fact to have any great social future, any part to play in the renovation of society, for, consisting of only a few individuals, they can only end, as Dr. Buchner says, by creating beside the bourgeoisie or *third estate*, a *fourth estate*, having beneath it a *fifth estate* yet more wretched. On the other hand the productive societies arising from the *trade's unions*[1] will embrace whole industries and invade great industry, thus forming the NEW CORPORATION; a corporation which we well know bourgeois economists will gladly confuse with the old tyranny, although the latter was hierarchically organized, founded on monopoly and privilege and limited to a certain number of members (just as our present little productive associations are) while the former will be organised equitably, founded on mutuality and justice and open to all * * *

Then, this transformation of trade unions will take place not in one country alone, but in all, or all at least that are at the head of civilisation: in a word, all these associations of all countries, federated, will first intervene for purposes of struggle, using their federation for the reciprocal exchange of products at cost price, in international mutual exchange thus replacing both the Protectionism and Free Trade of the bourgeois economists * *

Basle, 1869.

[11*th September: Debate on Trade Unions.*]

Chemalé [*France*] says that he has only one remark to make—capital is centralized and labour should be so too. He does not wish to discuss the utility of Trade Unions and will merely support the Committee's conclusions. He does not believe that unions have any other use than to aid in the solution of the questions of strikes and wages and thinks that they will disappear in the social democratic State * *

Hins [*Belgium*]: Citizen Chemalé has not understood the idea which led to the raising of this question. Trade Unions will continue to exist after the suppression of the wage system, not in name but in fact: they will then be the organisations of labour. They will be the conversion of Free Trade, they will be in charge of a vast allocation of work from one end of the world to the other. They will take the place of the old political structures: instead of a confused and heterogeneous system of representation we shall have the representation of labour.

At the same time they will be agents of decentralization, for the centres will vary according to industries, which will, so to speak, form each a State apart, and make absolutely impossible a return to the old form of centralized state. This will not prevent the existence of another form of government for local relations.

As will be seen, if we are reproached with being indifferent to all forms of government, it is not because we are content with the first comer, but because we detest them all for the same reason, and because we think that only on their ruins can be built a society conforming to the principles of justice.

[1] In English in the original.

INDEX

INDEX

ADVOCATES of S. Petersburg, Resolution of, 366
Agriculture and Chartism, 132. See also Arch: Land and Peasants
Albert, 173, 189, 209
Amalgamated Society of Engineers, 111
America: Declaration of Independence, 4; War of Independence, 3, 118; and Modern Industry, 141
Andler, 140 (note)
Arbeiter Club, 242, 255–7
Arch, and Agricultural Trades Unionism, 82
Army: Babouvist Leaflet addressed to, 57; and Chartism, 99–100; Blanqui's proposals on, 219; German Republicans and, 252–3, 262; Paris Commune and, 319
Associations, Law on (1791), 37
Austria: War with French Revolution, 17, 34; and the Hungarian Revolution, 222–9 *passim;* and Italy, 231–3; in 1848, 240, 242, 243, 244, 246; Proceedings of the Diet (1848), 259–62.

BABEUF, 6 (note), 8 (note); His Policy, 24; Analysis of Doctrine, 56–7; Leaflet of Babouvists, 57–8; Draft of Decrees, 58–9; and Chartists, 107
Baden (1848), 241, 247, 257
Baku, Massacre at, 351, 352
Bakunin, 282
Barbès, 168, 169, 171, 172, 173; Placard, 206; Decrees, 207
Basle Conference (1869), 394
Bastille, 12
Batthyanyi, 222, 224
Bavaria, 242
Belfast Volunteers (1791), Declaration of, 65–6
Belloc, 10, 14 (note), 19 (note), 32 (note)
Beslay, 285, 310
Bismarck, 272, 307, 312, 328, 330, 331, 335, 336
Black Hundreds: 343, 354; Proclamations of, 372, 380
Blanc, Louis: His *Organisation of Labour*, 165, 186–7; 166, 170, 171, 172, 175, 179 (note), 191; His Programme, 199–201; 199 (note), 202 (note), 209, 216, 217, 277 (note)
Blanqui: 139, 140, 166, 168, 171, 173; Speech, 191; 207, 209 (note); *Critique Sociale*, 218–20; 277, 278, 282; *La Patrie en Danger*, 288–9
Bolsheviks, 347
Born, Stephen, 242, 255
Boulage, 210
Bouniols, *Histoire de la Révolution de* 1848, 179 (note)
Bourgeoisie: In French Revolution, 9, 22, 194; in England (1832), 82; and Chartists 106–7, 109 (note); Communist view of, 141–163 *passim;* in France (1848), 165–184 *passim;* in Ireland (1848), 265; and Paris Commune, 280; and 1848 Revolutionaries, 281; Millière on, 293–4; Marx on, 305–338 *passim;* in Russia, 347–9
Bourgin, *Histoire de la Commune*, 280 (note)
Brentano, L., 247, 263
Brissot, 16, 17, 50
Broglie, 12
Browne, John, 100
Brussels Conference (1868), 393
Builders' Union, 82
Builders' Guild (1833), 84, 91–2
Bund, the Jewish, 348
Buonarroti, *Histoire de la Conspiration pour l'Egalité*, 56 (note), 113 (note)
Bussey, P., Speech on Arming, 117

CABET, 161 (note), 169, 207, 218
Cadet Party (Russia), 355–361 *passim;* 369 (note). See also Viborg Manifesto
Cahiers, The, of 1788, 8
Cambridge *Modern History*, 245 (note), 348 (note), 352 (note)
Camphausen, 243
Capital: Smith on, 94; and Communism, 139, 146, 149, 150; Louis Blanc on, 187; and Arbeiter Club, 256; Millière on, 294; and Paris Commune, 318, 322; in Russia, 346
Carlyle, 17
Casati, 231, 232
Castelar, Emilio, 272
Caussidière, 189, 207, 209
Cavaignac, 178, 179, 180, 215–6
Central Committee of the National Guard (1871), 279, 285; Manifesto 289–91; Marx on, 313, *et seq.*
Central Fraternal Society (1848), 169, 207 (note)
Central Republican Society (1848), 168
Champs de Mars, Manifesto signed in, 16, 138
Charles Philippe, 39 (note), 76
Chartists: 89, 103–136; History of, 104–12; and Radicalism, 106; Convention of, Resolutions, etc., 124, 126, 135; First National Petition, 127–9; Second National Petition, 130–2. See also Bussey, Coombe, Jones, London Working Men's Association, Poor Law, Stephens, Trade Unions
Chaumette and the "Enragés," 20, 21
Chevremont, 193
Church: In French Revolution, 14, 32, 47; and Proposals of Blanqui, 219; in Ireland 64; and Chartism, see Stephens; in Italy (1848), 232, 236; and the Commune, 320; in Russia, 344–5, 353, 369, 379. See also Pogrom
Clubs, French (1848), Decrees of, 207–9
Cole, G. D. H., 38 (note), 357 (note)
Commission of the Workers (1848). See Luxembourg
Committee of Public Safety: (1789), 21; (1848), Decrees, 207–9; (1871), 300, 303
Commune of Paris: (1791), 15, 18, 19, 23, 46, 169; (1871), 275–338; Composition, 280; Decrees, etc., 284, 291, 295, 296, 297, 302, 304, Programme, 285, 298–300; Marx's Civil War in France, 305–38
Commune in Russia, 343–4
Communism: In 18th century, 6, 7, 8; in French Revolution, 22, 23, 55, 58–60; and Owen, 83; and O'Connor, 133–4; Manifesto of 1847, 139–63; and Property, 150, 151, 152, 154, 163; and Free Trade, 151; and the Family, 152–3; and Education, 152, 154; and Nationalism, 149, 153; and Religion, 153–4; and Feudal Socialism, 155–6; and Middle-Class Socialism, 156–7; and German Socialism, 157–9; and Conservative Socialism 159–60; and Utopian Socialism, 160–2; in various countries, 162; Blanqui on, 218; and Germany (1848), 240; and Hungarian Revolution, 222; and Ireland (1848), 265, 269. See also International.
Connolly, *Labour in Ireland*, 65, 265 (note)
Coombe, J. C., on the Charter, 123
Cooper, T., 106–7
Co-operation: And Owen, 83, 84, 91 (note); 99; Growth of, 112; and O'Connor, 133–4; in France (1848) 170 (note), (1871) 297; and Communism, 323
Corday, Charlotte, 49
Cordeliers, "The Old," 52–3
Cordeliers Club, 16; Resolution, 13, 28–30; Declaration on Tyrannicides, 38
Corn Laws, Repeal of, 109, 111
Craig, Hugh, 125
Crimean War, 271
Crisis, The, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 91 (note), 101

DAILY NEWS, 338
Danton, 13, 18, 19, 20, 22; Speech on Property, 41
Declaration of Independence: (American), 4; (Hungarian), 226
Declaration of Rights of Man, 13, 30–1
Delescluze, 285, 286; Proclamation, 304–5
Démocratie Pacifique, 169
Denis, 284, 285
Denmark, War with Germany, 245
Derby Committee (1833), 93

Derby Turnouts, The, 87, 88
Desmoulins, Camille, 52
Dillon, *Life of Mitchell*, 265 (note)
" Document, The" (London Tailors, 1834), 85, 101
Doherty and Trade Unions, 82
Dorchester Labourers, The, 87, 99
Dufaure, 329–30
Duma, 352, 354-61 *passim*; 372. See also Viborg Manifesto
Dumouriez, 12 (note), 18, 20, 21, 42, 43
Dupont, 190
Dyer, *History of Modern Europe*, 280 (note)

EDUCATION, 20 (note), 78, 91, 152, 154, 155, 220, 249, 284, 320, 364, 376
Emmet, 63; Proclamation, 68-9
Engels, 104, 105, 140
England (1832–54), 79–136
English Economic History, Select Documents, 125 (note)
" Enragés," The, 20
Equality, 4, 30, 54, 56, 67, 113, 123, 187, 244

FABRE, A, 78 (note)
Factory Acts, 111
Favre, Jules, 306, 307, 312, 330, 331
Federation of the Just, 140
Feminism, 284, 300–2. See also Leo, and Woman Suffrage
Ferdinand of Austria, Proclamation (1848), 252
Feudal Rights, Decree on (1793), 50
Feuerbach, Letter on Economic Conditions, 243, 254
Feuillants Club, 16
Fisher, H. A. L. *The Republican Tradition*, 176 (note), 280 (note), 285 (note)
Fitzgerald, Lord E., 63
Flocon, 174
Forty-Seven Sections of Paris (1792), Address, 40
Fourier, 160, 161 (note)
France: And America, 3; Revolution (1789) 5–60, Effect on Ireland 63, and Belfast Volunteers 65, View of Lamartine on 194, View of Marx on 318; (1830–1) 75–8, Plan of Republican Party 78, View of Marx on 318; (1848) and Chartism, 110; 165–220; Proclamations, etc., 214–6; Effect on Hungary 222, on Italy 231, on Germany 241, 245, on Ireland 269; (1871), see Commune
Frankfurt. See National Assembly of Germany
Fraternal Association of Bureaucrats, 169 (note)
Frederick William of Prussia (Declaration of Pillnitz), 39; of 1848, 242; Proclamation to Berliners, 242, 253
Free Trade, and Communism, 151
Freiligrath, 242 (note)
Friends of the People, 169

GAGERN, VON, 241
Gallifet, 337-8
Gambetta, 278
Gapon, 350–1; Petition, 363; Letter, 365; 370 (note)
Garibaldi, 232
Garnier-Pagès, 190, 191, 198
Germany: And Communism, 162; Revolution of 1848, 239–63; Introduction, 239–47; Offenburg Programme, 249; Republican Poster, 249; Hanau People's Commission, 250; Austrian Emperor's Proclamation, 252; Democrats to the Soldiers, 252; King of Prussia's Proclamation, 253; Feuerbach's Letter on Economic Conditions, 254; Arbeiter Club, 255; Hecker on Baden Revolt, 257; *Republican Gazette*, 258; Austrian Diet, 260; Resolutions of Revolutionary Assembly, 262
Gill, *Naval Mutinies of* 1797, 71 (note), 74 (note)
Girondins, 9, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22; Decree on Communal Lands, 40; and the Commune, 46. See also Guadet and Brissot
Glove Workers, Election Placard (1848), 193
Godwin, 63 (note)
Goegg, 263
Gorce, de la, 179 (note)
Görgei, General, 223, 224, 228
Grousset, 303
Guadet, 16; Speech on Suppression of Commune, 46–7
Guilds in French Revolution, 15
Guillaume, *L'Internationale*, 282 (note)
Guillet, J. J., 214
Guizot, 140, 166

HAMMOND, *The Town Labourer*, 104 (note)
Hanau People's Commission, 242, 250–1
Haynau, General, 223, 232 (note)
Hebert and Hebertists, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23; and Marat's death, 48, 53. See *Père Duchesne*
Hecker, Fr., 240, 242, 244; on the First Baden Revolt, 257
Herald of the Rights of Industry, The, 85, 98
Herve, Edouard, 332
Huber, 172, 207
Hungary (1848), 222–9, 246; Declaration of Independence, 226–8; Abdication of Provisional Government, 228–9. See Kossuth and Magyar
Hunt and Chartism, 104
Hyndman, *Commercial Crises of the xixth Century*, 165 (note)

INDUSTRIAL Revolution, 76, 82, 141, 272
Insurgents' Proclamations (France, 1848), 214
International, The First, 272, 277, 280; Foundation of, 281; and Paris Commune, 282, 283 286; The Civil War in France, 305–38; 336 348; Debates and Resolutions 392–4
International, the Second, 281
Ireland (1786–1803), 61–9; and French Revolution, 63; Rebellion of 1798, 63; Letter to Munster Peasantry, 64; Declaration of Belfast Volunteers, 65; Oath of United Irishmen, 66 Proclamation of John Sheares, 67; Proclamation of Robert Emmett, 68; (1848), 265–70 Resolutions of O'Brien, 266; Mitchel's Letter to Ulstermen, 267; *The Irish Felon* on June Revolt in Paris, 269; Lalor's *Faith of a Felon* 270
Irish Confederation, 266–7
Irish Famine, The, 110, 265
Italy (1848), 230–8; Manifesto to the European Peoples, 234; Letter of Manin on Socialism 235; Decrees of Roman Republic, 236–7; Last Proclamation of Venetian Ministry of Marine 237

JACOBINS: 9, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21; Social Policy, 22; Address of Jacobin Club, 41–3 Decree on Communal Lands, 47; English, 7
Jaeckh: *The International*, 282 (note)
Jellachich, 223, 246
Jemmappes, 21, 41
Jones, Ernest: *Song of Lower Classes*, 107, 135 and Chartism, 111

KALER, *Wilhelm Weitling*, 140 (note)
Kniaz Potemkin, Manifesto of Crew, 374
Kossuth, 222, 223, 224; His Six Points, 225; 227 229, 272
Kropotkin, 15 (note), 284

LABOUR Exchanges: and Owen, 84; in France (1848), 198–9
Labourer, The, 133
Lafayette, 3, 13, 14, 16, 18, 23
Lalor, J. Fintan: *The Faith of a Felon*, 270
Lamartine, 168, 175, 177, 180, 181; Manifesto to Europe, 193–7
Land Question in France, 8, 18; and Jacobins 22, 47; Church Lands, 32; and Girondins, 40
Land Question in Italy (1848), 236

Land Question, in Russia, 343–8. See also Peasants
Laprade, 63 (note)
Lausanne Conference (1867), 392
Laveleye, *Socialism of To-day*, 170 (note)
League of Russian Men, 343; Proclamations, 372, 380
Ledru-Rollin, 162 (note), 165, 166, 167, 171, 175, 180, 181, 182; Election Address, 187–9; 190, 207, 209; Speech on Family and Property, 216–7; 272, 277 (note)
Legge, J. G., *Rhyme and Revolution in Germany*, 242 (note), 254 (note)
Lenin, 355 (note)
Leo, Mme. André, "Revolution without Women," 300–2
Leopold of Austria, 39
Lettish Manifesto, 353, 373–4
Lettish Social Democrats, Appeal, 386–90
Levasseur, *Histoire des classes ouvrières en France*, 37 (note)
Liberals in France, 166
Liberals in Russia, 349–61 *passim;* Trotsky on, 369
Lichtenberger, *Le Socialisme et la Révolution Française*, 41 (note)
Lissagaray, *History of the Commune*, 283, 284 (note)
Liste Complette de Messieurs les Députés, 11 (note)
Lloyd Jones, *Life of Owen*, 83 (note), 84 (note)
Loi Chapelier, 15
London Democrat, The, 123
London Working Men's Association, 104, 106; Petition, 113
Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, 180, 181, 183, 184, 233, 241, 277, 318, 321, 330
Louis Philippe, 76, 165–6, 321
Louis XVI, 7–24 *passim*, 38; Manifesto on Flight to Varennes, 38–9; 40
Lovett and Chartism, 106, 108, 109, 125, 127
Luxembourg Commission (1848), 169, 171; Election Placards, 193, 204, 213; Conciliation Awards of, 202–3
Lyons: Revolts, 76; Declaration, 78; 187

MAGYAR Language, 222; Bill on, 225
Maillebois, Conspiracy of, 32, 33
Malthus, 121
Manifesto, of the Equals (1796), 54–6
Manifesto of the Republican Party (1855), 273–4
Manin, Daniele: 233; Letter on Socialism, 235
Marat: 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20; His Character, 22; His *Ami du Peuple*, 26–8; His *C'en est fait de nous*, 32–5; 42, 48–50
Maréchal: 8 (note); Manifesto of the Equals, 54; 139
Marie, 190, 192, 201
Marx: 139, 140, 166, 180, 213; *Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, 240 (note); *New Rhenish Gazette*, 240; and the First International, 281, 282, 286; *Civil War in France*, 305–38; and Bolsheviks, 348; 392
Mathy, Karl, 241, 242
Maximalists, 348 (note)
Mazzini: 231, 232, 236 (note), 272; and First International, 281
Menard, 215
Mensheviks, 347, 360
Metternich, 76, 140, 222, 231, 240, 242
Miliukov, 347, 352, 354, 356, 360, 361
Millière: His *Revolution of* 1871, 284, 292–5; 307
Mir, 343, 344, 348
Mirabeau, 13, 14; Speech on Emigrés, 35–6
Mirsky, Prince, 349, 350, 369
Mitchel: 245; Letters to Ulstermen, 267–9
Morelly, *Code de la Nature*, 6 (note)
Morrison, James, 86, 88, 89, 92
Mountain, The. See Jacobins
Municipal Inquiry Committee (1790), 33–4
Munster Peasantry, Letter to, 64–5
Mutualism, 392

NAPIER, General, 108, 125, 126 (note)
Naples, 76, 231
National Assembly (France, 1789), 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15; Oath in the Tennis Court, 26; Declaration of the Rights of Man, 30–1; Decree Confiscating Church Lands, 32
National Assembly (Germany, 1848), 245–7
National Association for the Protection of Labour (1830), 82
National Union of the Working Classes, 83
National Workshops (1848), 171, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178; Decree instituting, 201; Regulations, 205; Decree concerning, 210; Placard, 213
Navy, Russian, Mutiny of, 353. See Kniaz Potemkin
Navy, English, Mutiny of. See Nore
Necker, 12
Nevinson, *Dawn in Russia*, 358 (note), 386 (note)
Nicholas II. See Tsar
Noailles, Vicomte de, His Motion, 26–7
Noblesse in France (1789), 10
Nore, Mutiny at, 63, 71–4; Oath of Seamen, 74; Song of Seamen, 74; Manifesto, 73–4; Resolution of Committee, 74
Northern Star, The, 109
Nostag, Jules, His "Country—Humanity," 297–8

OASTLER, R., 105
Oath in Tennis Court, The, 11, 26
O'Brien, Bronterre, 24, 56 (note), 83, 107, 109; His Statement of Aims, 113
O'Brien, W. Smith, His Resolutions, 266
O'Connor, Feargus: 104, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111; Speech on Physical Force, 119; on Communism, 133–4
O'Driscol, Letter to Munster Peasantry, 64
Offenburg Conference: Programme, 241, 249; Pamphlet, 252; Resolutions of Revolutionary Assembly, 262–3
Operative Builders' Union (1852), 83, 90
Orr, 68
Osvoboshdenye Group, 369
Owen, Robert: 82–9 *passim;* Address to Builders, 90; Lecture, 91; and Builders' Guild, 91; Legacy, 95–7; Lecture on *The Pioneer*, 100; 104, 160, 161 (note), 169

PAINE, Tom, 30 (note), 63 (note)
Pares, Bernard, 348
Party of Order (1848), 170, 171, 181, 182, 183, 309, 318, 324, 325
Peasantry: In Commune (1871), 324, 325; in Russia, 341, 343, 353, 355, 361
Peasants' Union, 353, 354; Programme, 372; Resolutions and Reports, 375–9, 382–3
Pelletan, *La Semaine de Mai*, 386 (note)
Père Duchesne, 20, 22; on Marat's Assassination, 48–50; on Business Men, 51–2; 53
Petition of Workers to Tsar, 363–5
Physiocrats, 7
Piedmont, Revolutionary Movement (1821–3), 76
Pillnitz, Declaration of, 16, 39
Pimienta, *Propagande Bonapartiste en* 1848, 177 (note)
Pioneer, The, 86, 87, 91 (note), 93–4, 100
Pitt, 46, 51, 53, 63 (note)
Plehve, von, 349
Pobiedonostsev, 341, 345
Pogrom Circular, 372, 380–1
Poland, Communism in, 162
Police in Russia, 342, 343
Political Economy in 18th Century, 7; and France (1830), 76
Poor Law: and Owen, 91; Act of 1834, 104–5; Stephens on, 122; and Chartists, 131
Populaire, 169
Pouyer-Quertier, 311, 312, 330–1
Pragmatic Sanction, 227
Press, Liberty of, 52–3, 78, 226, 243, 249, 251, 357, 364
Proletariat: and Communist Manifesto, 140–9 *passim;* and France (1848), 171–2; and Germany (1848), 240; and Millière, 293; France (1871), 305, 314–38 *passim;* in Russia, 347

Property: and Girondins, 17; in Declaration of Rights of Man, 31; Danton on, 41; Robespierre's Speech on, 43–5; 55; and Babeuf, 58–9; and France (1830), 78; O'Connor on, 134; and Communism, 150, 151, 154, 155; and Party of Order, 171; Ledru-Rollin on, 217; Blanqui on, 219; Mazzini on, 236 (note); and the Commune, 322; and Peasants' Union, 377, 379; and International, 392–4
Proudhon, 159, 169, 205 (note), 283
Provisional Governments (1848), Proclamations of, 189; Decrees of, 191, 192
Prussia, 240–7 *passim*, 305, 310, 335
Pujol, L., 179; His Prophecy, 211

Rapport fait au Comité de Recherches (1790), 33 (note)
Raspail, 169, 207, 209
Reform Bill (1832), 82, 128
Reilly, T.D., 270
Reimpression de l'Ancien Moniteur, 37 (note)
Renard, *Histoire Socialiste*, 165, 175 (note), 178 (note), 179 (note), 180 (note), 181
Republicans: In Germany (1848), 240-1; Poster, 249; Proclamation, 252. See also Hecker, Offenburg, Struve
Révolution La, 297 (note)
Revolution: In France (1789) 5–60, (1830) 75–8, (1848) 165–220; in Hungary (1848), 222–9; in Italy (1848), 230–8; in Germany (1848), 239–63; in Russia (1905), 339–391. See also Commune of Paris, Ireland, Nore
Revue Historique de la Revolution Française, 32 (note)
Rights of Man, 30. See also Equality
Rise and Fall of Chartism in Monmouthshire, 109 (note)
Robespierre: 18, 20; His Policy, 22; 23; Speech on Property, 43–5; 206
Roland, Mme., 16
Rousseau, 10, 37 (note), 38 (note), 195
Roverdino, 78
"Rurals," The, 279, 311, 324–31 *passim*, 326
Russian Revolution of 1905, 339–92; Introduction, 339–61; Documents, 363–92
Ryan, *Irish Labour Movement*, 84 (note)

St. SIMON, 160, 169
Salut Publique, La, 305 (note)
Savardin, 33, 34
Schurz, Carl, 241
Sedan, 277
Senard, 215
Sergius, Grand Duke, 352, 370, 372
Sharman, Colonel, 65
Sheares, John, Proclamation of, 67
Siêyes, 7
Sismondi, 157
Slosson, 111
Smith, J. E., 9, 86, 88, 89; Letter on Associated Labour, 93–4; on Prospects of Society, 98
Sobrier, 167, 173, 189, 207
Social Democratic Republic (France, 1848), 178
Social Democratic Party in Russia, 347; Resolutions of, 366–7; 382
Social Revolutionary Party (Russia), 345, 347, 348; Announcement, 370–1
Socialism: In 18th Century, 6, 7; and Owen, 83, 107; and Communism, 139; Feudal, 155–6; Christian, 156; Middle-class, 156–7; in France (1848), 166–84 *passim;* and Ledru-Rollin, 216; and Mazzini, 231; Manin's Letter on, 235; and International, 281; and Commune, 283; in Russia, 342–50 *passim;* Manifesto of Russian Socialist Parties, 385
Society for Promoting National Regeneration, 98
Soviet, 98, 170, 205, 355, 356, 357; Minutes of, 381–3, 385 (note)
Spain, 76
Spiridonova, Marie, 343 (note)
States-General, 6, 8, 11
Stephens, Rev. J. R., 105; Extract from Sermons, 119–22
Stiles, W. H., *Austria in* 1848–9, 225
Stolypin, 342, 347, 357, 359, 361; Document, 384–5
Strikes: and Owen, 84, 85, 91; in 1834, 87; *The Crisis* on, 101; and Chartists, 109, 110, 124, 132; and France (1848), 172, 183 (note); and Luxembourg Commission, 170, 202, 203; in Russia, 346, 351; and Gapon, 350; and Soviet, 354–8 *passim;* 381–3 *passim*
Struve, G., 240, 246; *Republican Official Gazette*, 258
Sub-contracts, Decree on (France, 1848), 197
Switzerland, Communism in, 162; War of the Sonderbund, 250; Szechenyi, Count, 222

TAXATION: and Jacobins, 21, 22; and Noailles, 27; and Rights of Man, 31; Robespierre on, 45; in Kossuth's Six Points, 225; and Germany (1848), 249, 259, 263; and Russia, 364
Temps, Le, 338
Thiers, 168, 272, 279, 285, 286, 295 (note), 305–35 *passim*
Third Estate, 9
Thomas: *Ateliers Nationaux*, 170 (note), 174 (note), 175 (note); 176; His Scheme, 176, 198, 205; 177, 201; Workshop Regulations, 205–6; 210, 213
Thomas, Clement, 314, 329, 330, 331
Tommaseo, 238
Trade Unions: In England, 82–89 *passim;* Grand National Consolidated Trades Union, 86–9; Smith on, 93–4; Owen on, 97; Programme of, 99; and Chartists, 110, 132, 133; Revival of, 111; in France (1848), 174; in Russia, 341, 352; and First International, 393, 394
Trélat, 177, 178
Trepov, 351, 352, 354, 355, 369
Trevelyan, G. M., *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic*, 233 (note)
Triage, 47
Tridon, *Les Hébertistes*, 20 (note)
Trochu, 305, 306, 334
Trotsky, 348, 350 (note), 353 (note), 355, 357; Events in St. Petersburg, 369–70
Tsar, 339–61 *passim;* Message to Workers' Delegates, 368–9; Manifesto of March 3, 371–2
Turgot, 7

UNION of Unions, 352, 353, 356
United Irishman, The, 267-8
United Irishmen, 63; Oath of, 66; and Nore Mutiny, 71
Urbarium, 226

VENDÉE, La, 18, 21, 51
Vendôme Column, 284, 296
Venice, 18, 21, 51, 231, 232, 233, 235, 237
Vergniaud, 16
Viborg Manifesto, 391

WALLING, *Russia's Message*, 361, 384 (note)
Webb, S. and B., *History of Trade Unionism*, 86 (note)
Weitling, 140
Whiteboys, The, 64
Witte, Count, 342, 344, 346, 355, 357, 358, 382
Wolff, A., *Berliner Revolutionschronik*, 255 (note)
Woman Suffrage and Chartism, 106 (note). See also Feminism and Leo
Women and Communism, 153
Workers' Control, 392-394

YOUNG, ARTHUR, 7

ZEMSTVOS, 347, 349, 350, 351, 352, 354, 356; Resolution of Congress, 380; Resolution of Novgorod Zemstov, 367

Printed at the Pelican Press, 2 Carmelite Street, E.C

REVOLUTION
1789 to 1906

Documents selected and edited with Notes and Introductions

By

R. W. POSTGATE

HOUGHTON
MIFFLIN
COMPANY

$4.50

A HISTORY OF FRANCE

From the Earliest Times to the Treaty of Versailles

By William Stearns Davis

Professor of History in the University of Minnesota and author of "A History of Mediæval and Modern Europe"

"PROFESSOR DAVIS'S work is characterized by excellent scholarship. The author achieves a happy medium between prolixity and superficiality, and his carefully conceived and agreeably written book deserves to take rank as the standard single-volume history of France in the English language." — *New York Tribune.*

"The book is as readable as it is orderly and balanced." — *New York Post.*

"For succinctness and clarity, there is no better book on the subject in the English language." — *St. Louis Post-Dispatch.*

RECENT HISTORICAL BOOKS

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 09938 983 3

THE PEA — ***Robert Lansing***

A book i[illegible]s taken behind the scenes in Paris and shown the Peace Conference as it was seen by one of the actual commissioners. *Illustrated.*

A JOURNAL OF THE GREAT WAR — ***Charles G. Dawes***

An invaluable contribution to the history of the war behind the lines by the General Purchasing Agent for the A.E.F. 2 vols. *Illustrated.*

THE AMERICAN RELIEF ADMINISTRATION — ***Thomas H. Dickinson***

A history of economic reconstruction in Europe during the Armistice, including correspondence between Hoover and President Wilson and divers European rulers and leaders, all of the very first importance and historical interest.

THE MARITIME HISTORY OF MASSACHUSETTS 1783-1860 — ***S. E. Morison***

The first adequate story of Massachusetts' maritime career, profusely illustrated with rare and curious paintings, old prints, etc. Edition limited to 275 copies.

FRENCH CIVILIZATION. From its Origins to the Close of the Middle Ages — ***Albert Léon Guérard***

"History could scarcely be written with greater charm." — *London Observer.*

THE PILGRIMS OF PLYMOUTH — ***Henry Cabot Lodge***

Senator Lodge's Plymouth oration will rank with the finest pieces of American oratory. Special limited edition of 500 copies.

THE PILGRIM REPUBLIC (*New Edition*) — ***John Abbott Goodwin***

Since its first publication in 1888, this has been recognized as the standard book in its field. *Illustrated.*

PLYMOUTH AND THE PILGRIMS — ***Arthur Lord***

A readable and authoritative volume by the Chairman of the Plymouth Tercentenary Celebration Committee.

EMANCIPATION OF MASSACHUSETTS — ***Brooks Adams***

"No one interested in the progress of free thought can neglect to read this trenchant essay." — *Boston Herald.* New edition with preface.

THE INDUSTRIAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND — ***Abbott Payson Usher***

"An adequate continental background of English economic history without which it has been impossible to understand the evolution of British industry." — *Journal of Education.*

A HISTORY OF FRANCE — ***William Stearns Davis***

"This carefully conceived and agreeably written book deserves to take rank as the standard single volume history of France in the English language." — *New York Tribune. Illustrated.*